DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 147 EA 019 252

TITLE	Educational Administration: Leadership Preparation, a Review. Commission Working Paper.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Atlanta.
PUB DATE	Feb 85
NOTE	214p.; For related documents, see ED 180 106, ED 194 515, and ED 250 820.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2945 Flowers Road South, Suite 107, Atlanta, GA 30341 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *Educational Administration; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Internship Programs; Job Analysis; Leadership Responsibility; *Management Development; *Program Descriptions; Public Opinion; Student Recruitment; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Georgia

ABSTRACT

This report (1) examines the latest developments in educational administration preparation, (2) provides an overview of educational administration programs in Georgia, and (3) identifies and reviews a sample of educational administration programs nationally. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 are titled as follows: "Public Concerns: A Focus on School Leadership," "School Leadership: Nature of the Job," and "Administrator Preparation Programs: Professional Views and Assessments." Chapter 4, "Educational Administration Programs: A General Profile," describes typical program characteristics and the following issues and trends: student selection/recruitment; residency; faculty in educational administration; practitioner involvement in instruction; internships/field experience; and university/school district inservice relationships. Chapter 5, "Preservice Preparation for School Administrators: Various Approaches," contains brief summaries of approaches to educational administration programs developed by four esteemed educational researchers: (1) Keith Goldhammer ("Six Key Elements"); (2) John Hoyle ("AASA Guidelines"); (3) Lloyd McCleary ("Field Based Preparation"); and (4) Paula Silver ("A Professional Practice Orientation"). Chapter 6, "Educational Administration Preparation Programs: Parameters of This Study," contains observations and charts describing characteristics of Georgia educational administration programs, research procedures for pyramid study, and observations and charts describing characteristics of a sample of educational administration programs nationally. An extensive bibliography is appended. (IW)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED280147

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: LEADERSHIP PREPARATION, A REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Suzanne R. Harrison
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

February, 1985

Georgia
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
Suite 107
2945 Flowers Road South
Atlanta, Georgia 30341
(404)/656-2535

EA 019 352

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEMBERS, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
1985

LOUISE RADLOFF
CHAIRMAN
Member, Gwinnett County Board of Education
Norcross

NANCY R. BEASLEY
Media Specialist
Cartersville Elementary School
Cartersville

MARY W. CALLINS
Student Personnel Specialist
Coosa Valley Vocational High School
Rome

GUY H. DAVIS
Member, Carroll County Board of Education
Villa Rica

SHERMAN R. DAY
Interim Director of Athletics
Georgia State University
Atlanta

ANNE FLOWERS
Dean, School of Education
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro

CARL E. FRANKLIN
Instructor of Physics
The Westminster Schools
Atlanta

LOUIS E. HARPER
Superintendent
Ben Hill County Schools
Fitzgerald

ALICE KLEMMETSEN
Fifth Grade Teacher
Mableton Elementary School
Austell

EDWARD B. MARTIN
Principal
West Laurens Senior High School
Dublin

CHARLES R. NASH
Dean, School of Education
Armstrong State College
Savannah

PEGGY C. NEAL
Mathematics Teacher
Burney Harris Middle School
Athens

W. J. ROCHELLE
Principal
Dalton High School
Dalton

WERNER ROGERS
Associate State Superintendent of Schools
Planning and Development
Atlanta

CAROLYN W. SAMPSON
Principal
H.A. Hunt Elementary School
Fort Valley

DANDY P. TAYLOR
Third Grade Teacher
White Bluff Elementary School
Savannah

JOSIE WILLS
Business Education Teacher
Academy of Richmond County
Augusta

Educational Administration: Leadership Preparation, A Review

Commission Working Paper

LOUISE RADLOFF
Chairman

SHERMAN R. DAY
Vice Chairman

SUZANN R. HARRISON
Executive Secretary

SANDRA McGAHAN KOLKA
Senior Research Associate

February, 1985

Georgia
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
Suite 107
2945 Flowers Road South
Atlanta, Georgia 30341
(404)/656-2535

FOREWORD

This working paper is a natural outgrowth of the earlier working papers by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission: Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation (1979); Teacher Satisfaction in Georgia and the Nation: Status and Trends (1980); The Principal in Georgia: A Crucial Element in Quality Education (1983); and The Principalship in Georgia: Superintendents' Perceptions (1984). This paper is intended to complement and add to the findings of these previous studies.

The preparation of this report represents a serious effort 1) to examine the state-of-the-art in educational administration preparation, 2) to provide an overview of educational administration programs in Georgia, and, finally, 3) to identify and review a sample of educational administration programs nationally.

The Commission believes that the information contained in this working paper will assist in meeting the challenges of attracting, developing, and retaining quality leadership in the State. The Commission expresses grateful appreciation to the numerous individuals and institutions who assisted in this research endeavor. The Commission and staff express special recognition to the following:

- Georgia Institutions:

  Albany State College
  Atlanta University
  Augusta College
  Columbus College
  Emory University
  Georgia College
  Georgia Southern College
  Georgia State University
  University of Georgia
  Valdosta State College
  West Georgia College

- National Directors:

  David Imig--American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
  Paul Salmon--American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
  Samuel G. Sava--National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
  Scott D. Thomson--National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
  Don Cameron--National Education Association (NEA)

- Out-of-State Institutions:

  University of California-Berkeley
  Columbia University Teachers College
  University of Florida-Gainesville
  Harvard University
  University of Illinois--Urbana/Champaign
  New York University
  University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
  Ohio State University
  University of Texas-Austin
  University of Utah-Salt Lake City
  University of Washington-Seattle
  University of Wisconsin-Madison

- Ms. Sandra M. Kolka, Senior Research Associate, for assistance with data collection, research review, and the preparation of this working paper.

- Ms. Kay Holland, Administrative Assistant, for special attention to all of the technical aspects of this project;

The Commission shall be pleased to receive comments on this Working Paper and/or comments and suggestions regarding standards for teacher education, certification, and staff development in the State. Again, the Commission thanks all who assisted with this endeavor.

Louise Radloff

Louise Radloff
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Public Concerns: A Focus on School Leadership. 1

School Leadership: Nature of the Job. 13

Administrator Preparation Programs: Professional Views and Assessments 18

Educational Administration Programs: A General Profile 28

  Typical Program Characteristics 28

  Issues and Trends. 33

    Student Selection/Recruitment 37
    Residency. 40
    Faculty in Educational Administration 41
    Practitioner Involvement in Instruction. 45
    Internships/Field Experience 47
    University/School District Articulation: Implications for Inservice 50

Preservice Preparation for School Administrators: Various Approaches 56

  Approach One: Keith Goldhammer--Six Key Elements . . . 58
  Approach Two: John Hoyle--ASSA Guidelines 65
  Approach Three: Lloyd McCleary--Field Based Preparation 77
  Approach Four: Paula Silver--A Professional Practice Orientation 85

Educational Administration Preparation Programs: Parameters of This Study 95

  Georgia Educational Administration Programs: Some Observations. 100

  Georgia Educational Administration Program Characteristics. 103

  Research Procedures for Pyramid Study. 119

  National Educational Administration Programs: Some Observations. 123

  National Educational Administration Programs: Characteristics 128

Bibliography 162

PUBLIC CONCERNS: A FOCUS ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

This examination of preparatory programs for school principals and superintendents is especially appropriate in the wake of vigorous national activity and public attention directed toward identifying and encouraging educational reforms in our nation's public schools. Major reports such as Ernest Boyer's High School, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and A Nation at Risk have fueled qualitative questions and accountability concerns of legislatures, boards of education, local school districts, and the general public aimed at improving the local leadership and delivery of instruction in our school districts nationwide.

An accumulating body of research on leadership in general and school administration in particular indicates that "good principals make good schools." Baltzell and Dentler, in their recently released study on principal selection conducted for the National Institute of Education, Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators, underline this decade's educational focus as the purpose for their 65-page report:

> In recent years, concern has intensified as social and economic pressures on public education have expanded. The role of the principal has come to be seen as perhaps the most complex balancing act in public education. At the same time, it has also come to be seen as the pivotal position for effective educational leadership and renewal of public confidence.
> (Baltzell and Dentler, 1983, p. 1)

The public has, therefore, proposed a healthy list of assignments which are likely to require a good deal of homework on the part of school leaders and their support systems. Among these assignments are raising student achievement, evaluating teachers as part of merit-pay and career-ladder plans, creating an environment conducive to learning, and motivating the school staff and the community. These public demands coincide with the expressed needs and expectations the best principals and superintendents have for themselves.

The best principals, according to a 1979 study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), regard themselves as educators, not merely as "site managers":

> Schools are human institutions in which conflicts can be expected, in which activities are varied and often hectic and in which young people and staff need a secure and confident as well as outgoing administrative leader with a high tolerance for frustration and a high level of energy. (NASSP, Vol. III, 1979, p. 61)

Theodore R. Sizer, former dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, discusses this human element of effective schools in his recent New York Times article, "The Secret Ingredient: People":

> Read ten good articles describing ten "effective" schools and you will have read little about effective programs and a great deal about effective people. These schools "work" because the people driving them are able. Nothing else, ultimately, is very important. . . . The agenda for "effectiveness," then, should primarily focus on the human dimension--the teachers and principals. Authority (the power and freedom to adapt their work to the needs of their particular students), stability (core staffs that stay long enough to make the adaptations that mesh their goals with their students' needs), and good conditions

> (the personal connection between students and teachers)--and better salaries, for fairness' sake--are the key.
> (The New York Times, April 15, 1984)

Teacher and administrator cohesiveness is also the present focus of school boards across the nation as they direct their administrations to develop plans for improvement in student achievement based upon data from effective schools research. A national Effective Schools Council currently is being organized to serve as a clearinghouse for such projects. The Education Commission of the States (ECS), which monitors educational activity throughout the country, has reported that at least fifteen states and 875 local school districts now have their own "effective schools" projects. (The New York Times, April 15, 1984)

This new effort to identify and analyze schools that work is exemplified by the national Secondary School Recognition Program, sponsored by the United States Department of Education, in which panels of volunteer educators have traveled across the country in an effort to locate and call attention to first-rate high schools. This past year (1984) Georgia began participation in the national recognition program with its Georgia Public Schools of Excellence Program. Both nationally and in Georgia, Schools of Excellence were chosen

> based on their administrative leadership, teacher effectiveness, parent and community support, positive school environment, clear academic and behavioral goals, regular monitoring of student progress, well coordinated curriculum, evidence of student responsibility and effective staff development.
> (ALERT, Georgia Dept. of Education, May, 1984, p. 16)

The Georgia criteria stated above were also used in the exemplary school identification programs nationwide. These criteria expand upon traits of effective schools as discovered by researchers during the past two decades. (For an in-depth research synthesis on this topic, see Sweeney, 1982.) One of the most often cited of these studies was conducted by Ronald Edmonds, a researcher and senior assistant for instruction in the New York City school system, and his colleague, John Frederickson of Harvard. (Edmonds and Frederickson, 1978) They studied 25 Detroit and Lansing, Michigan, schools and identified five characteristics of successful schools: "strong leadership by the principal, clear teaching objectives, a safe and orderly school climate, high expectations for all students, and regular monitoring of student work through standardized tests." (Edmonds, 1979, p. 17)

Some critics of effective school research have asked whether these characteristics, which resulted from the study of primarily urban elementary schools, apply to non-urban schools or to high schools as well. (The New York Times, April 15, 1984) Michael Cohen, formerly of the National Institute of Education, also questions whether the above characteristics of effective schools are causes or effects, and he cites a lack of what he terms "clear-cut evidence of how schools actually have improved and which practices are most amenable to change." (The New York Times, April 15, 1984)

Despite these questions, studying the human elements of schools that work may be a natural outgrowth of all the national reports of commissions and political bodies. Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and author of one of the major reports, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (1983), comments in the recent *New York Times* "Spring Survey of Education": "You can only write so many national reports and pass so many acts by the legislature. Eventually you have to go back and ask what is happening in individual schools." (*The New York Times*, April 15, 1984)

"School effectiveness studies" in the 1960s investigated variables such as the number of library books, students' socioeconomic characteristics, and teacher/student ratios as possible measures of quality. During the middle 1970s and the 1980s, the research focus moved toward the processes involved in educational leadership. Repeatedly, the broad-based research (Brookover et al., 1979; Rutter, 1979; Edmonds, 1978; Wellisch et al., 1978; Madden et al., 1976; Weber, 1971) which tracks effective versus non-effective school leadership shows significant positive relationships between school achievement and instructional leadership behavior. Gordon Cawelti (1982, 1980) concludes one of his studies on this topic of school effectiveness with the observation that

> if principals can improve their skills *and* if their leadership efforts focus on the characteristics of effective teaching, one can anticipate more successful schools and a reduction in political moves to legislate learning, which as Goodlad has suggested, offer little hope for real school improvement.
> (Cawelti, 1982, p. 13)

If credence is given to research and national studies which point to the role of the school administrator as key to an effective school, how can his or her leadership be strengthened? Educational administrators themselves often report that their professional training does not always prepare them adequately for the job. (Boyer, 1983; Pitner, 1982; NASSP, 1979; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977; UCEA, 1973) The 1977-1979 NASSP study, The Senior High School Principalship (an update of one conducted by NASSP in 1965), provides a picture of the changes that have occurred in the position of the principalship after a decade of social and economic turbulence. The 1979 Summary Report of the NASSP draws the following conclusions on the preparation, recruitment, and selection of principals:

> The education and selection of principals today is uncoordinated, perhaps even casual. Studies show that among institutions of higher education there is a wide variety of selection criteria and professional courses for the principalship. Certification requirements also differ from state to state. . . .
>
> The best talent available must be encouraged to prepare for and assume the principalship. Sufficient knowledge exists about the skills required for success in the principalship to do better at identifying and placing promising persons than now ordinarily occurs.
> (NASSP, Vol. III, 1979, p. 60)

Although practitioners and professors of educational administration tend to agree that "sufficient knowledge exists" about the skills required for success in administration, differences and debates surround the relative emphases each of the content areas should receive in a graduate degree program in educational administration. Philosophical positions range from the advocacy of a broadly-learned educational leader to a highly specialized technical manager, but most programs seem to represent a compromise somewhere in-between. (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978, p. 8)

Survey data collected through national studies indicate that most principals and superintendents complete a graduate degree program in educational administration, with courses in school management, school law, plant and personnel, finance, history and philosophy of education, curriculum and program development, human relations, supervision of instruction, and labor negotiations. (Piper, 1983; NASSP, Vol. I, 1978, pp. 3, 9, 10; Silver and Spuck, 1978) Both the 1965 and 1977-79 NASSP studies (cited earlier) found that principals considered courses directly related to their jobs as educational administrators more essential than those that treat education more broadly. (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978)

Recent survey information (PSC, 1983) collected from principals in Georgia indicated that over 65% of Georgia's high school principals had completed a Master's degree in Administration and Supervision, as well as over 55% of the elementary and over 60% of the middle school principals. (PSC, 1983, p. 32) In addition, 34% of Georgia's principals reported completion of a six-year specialist's certificate, and 6.9% reported the doctorate. (PSC, 1983, p. 32) [NOTE: The majority of these degrees were granted from 1942-82--a period of forty years; over 50% of the degrees were granted from 1967-77.]

In general, most principals at all levels in Georgia who completed a graduate degree program in educational administration took courses in general school administration (89.4%), curriculum development (71.4%), school finance/economics (75.2%), school organization (78.0%), education and the law (77.7%), history and philosophy of education (48.0% in graduate school; 25% as undergraduates), educational psychology (37.2% in graduate school; 29.6% as undergraduates), and staff development (47.5%) (PSC, 1983, p. 34)

The most recent national study of the principalship (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978) showed a considerable increase (from data collected in the 1965 survey) in the perceived importance of school law and school management courses. NASSP speculates that the most obvious reasons are: 1) the major impact of court decisions and federal legislation; 2) the influence of the accountability movement; and 3) the demand for efficiency of operation. (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978) Despite these contemporary realities which impinge upon the principal's professional life, NASSP's comparison of its two principalship studies (1965 and 1977-79) reveals that principals have retained their views on the essential nature of the following three areas of study as a part of preservice education: 1) curriculum and program development; 2) human relations; and 3) supervision of instruction. (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978)

In general, NASSP's summary report of the 1977-79 principalship survey observed "dramatic shifts" within the field of educational administration in coursework emphasis, indicated by principals' rating of courses they considered essential to success:

> In 1977, school law, curriculum and program development, management, supervision of instruction, and human relations were all rated essential (in order given) by more than 70 percent of the principals surveyed. In 1965, only one course, supervision of instruction, was rated essential to success by more than 50 percent of the principals.
> (NASSP, Vol. III, 1979, p. 9)

Superintendents and principals from the State of Georgia also shared their perspectives concerning the necessary and useful components of a leadership core curriculum, reported in the Professional Standards Commission Working Papers The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education (September, 1983) and The Principalship in Georgia: Superintendents' Perceptions (August, 1984). Principals in Georgia were asked to indicate which of the graduate courses they had taken were the most useful in their present positions. Eighty percent (80%) of the sample of Georgia principals gave Education and the Law the strongest rating--"very useful." The Georgia principals chose School Personnel Management as the course of next greatest utility in their present positions--it received a "very useful" rating from 63.9% of the principals who responded. (PSC, 1983) [NOTE: As noted earlier, 90% of the public school principals in NASSP's national sample (1977-79) also ranked school law and school personnel administration as "highly useful" or "essential." (NASSP, Vol. III, 1979, p. 39)] The list which follows shows the courses rated most useful by Georgia principals in descending rank order:

Education and the Law	80.8%
School Personnel Management	63.9%
Business Administration	58.9%
School Finance/Economics	57.5%
General School Administration	57.4%
Staff Development	54.0%
School Organization	54.0%
Curriculum Development	49.2%

(PSC, 1983, p. 34)

Principals in Georgia also were asked to indicate content areas in which they desired additional preparation. Over 50% reported that they desired additional preparation in the areas of curriculum development (56.6%), evaluating teachers (51.2%), and staff development (50.0%). These responses did not vary by school grade level, geographic region, school size, or environment. (PSC, 1983) Thus, Georgia principals are in general agreement with principals from the latest national survey (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978) concerning the continuing importance of and skill development needs in the areas of curriculum and program development and supervision of instruction. (PSC, 1983; NASSP, Vol. I, 1978)

Superintendents from the State of Georgia also shared their perspectives concerning the necessary components of a leadership core curriculum for principals. Georgia superintendents suggested the following preservice coursework progression for the principalship as most useful and important, based upon their experience:

Instructional Evaluation/Supervision	90%
Curriculum Development	84%
Personnel Evaluation	82%
General School Administration	78%
Education and the Law	74%
Staff Development: Process and Practice	59%
School Finance/Economics	57%
School Organization	39%
Educational Psychology	14%
Public Administration	10%
History and Philosophy of Education	7%
Politics of Education	5%
Teacher Negotiations	3%
Sociology of Education	2%

(PSC, 1984, p. 32)

Thus, similar areas of major concern are expressed by Georgia principals (PSC, 1983), principals in the national NASSP (1979) study, and Georgia superintendents (PSC, 1984): instructional evaluation/supervision, curriculum development, and personnel evaluation. These three areas which pertain directly to the instructional program are considered by practicing school administrators to be most important and useful to effective performance as a principal. It would appear that the concept of the principal as instructional leader is as strong in the minds of present-day administrators as NASSP reported it was (in its earlier report on the principalship) in 1965. (NASSP, Vol. I, 1978) In reality, however, surveys and field research indicate that principals and superintendents must serve several masters: a critical public demanding improved student performance and improved test scores; school boards and legislatures demanding strict accountability and efficient personnel management; and the educators at the college and state levels who plan and deliver administrator preservice degree programs and certification requirements. This tension between the concept of the school administrator as instructional leader and the day-to-day political and practical realities surrounding the position identifies a key stress point affecting those who would attempt to serve as educational leaders. (NASSP, Vol. III, 1979)

During the Carnegie Foundation's high school visits in 1982, educational administrators surveyed in 500 school districts gave low ranking to the value of college and university preparation in helping them develop the necessary skills to deal with some of the stress described above. (Boyer, 1983) In their report, High School, Boyer and his colleagues include the following illustrative example of how some practicing administrators feel about their preservice academic training:

> The university people I dealt with in my educational administration courses hadn't been in a classroom in years; they didn't know what kids were like, and to my mind, they didn't care. What really got to me was the sense of being patronized . . . as though I was limited and unaware of what secondary education was all about . . . What they had to offer was really just Mickey Mouse courses that didn't reflect any of the realities in my high school. But that's what you have to put up with to get your ticket.

Boyer and his colleagues conclude:

> This portrait of poor training, conflict, and frustration painted by many principals reveals more than private irritation. It portrays, in fact, a crisis in leadership, which seriously undermines the effectiveness of the school. (Boyer, 1983, p. 223)

Practicing administrators are asking the general public and educational planners to become more aware of precisely what it means to be a school leader in the 1980s and beyond, and to consider the complex array of variables involved in effective contemporary administration when planning for educational improvement.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: NATURE OF THE JOB

Many recent research studies on educational leadership focus on the theme that all aspects of the theoretical education and training of administrators must better reflect actual practice. (Boyer, 1983; LoPresti, 1982; Cawelti, 1982, Hoyle, 1981; Pellicer, 1981; Pitner, 1981)

This past decade has produced a number of companion work activity studies of school administrators as educational researchers attempt to validate this theory (that preservice training should better reflect actual practice) through empirical observation and field study. These researchers (Dunigan, 1980; Bridges, 1977; Kelly, 1975; Wolcott, 1973) conclude that a discrepancy exists between the actual role of the principal and the idealized role.

This discrepancy also was reported in the Georgia Professional Standards Commission Working Paper The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education (September, 1983). Georgia principals reported the proportion of time they found necessary to spend at particular administrative tasks and ranked the roles they performed at school under the categories of "current role" and "ideal role." The PSC report noted that

> comparison of the actual versus desired proportional amounts of time for each of the five categories indicates that principals desire a change in the role they perform at school. This was further demonstrated in response to the question of the role they currently have as principal and the role they would ideally like to have as principal. (PSC, 1983, p. 59)

Wolcott (1973) and Kelly (1975) conducted work activity studies concerning the day-to-day activities of an elementary and a secondary school principal, respectively. They describe the principal as a person whose day is consumed with some formal aspects of administration but primarily with a plethora of informal one-on-one encounters in quick succession. These encounters include mediations between students, staff, parents, and the public and other administrators. In addition to this highly fragmented school workday, principals are expected to spend a considerable amount of time at meetings away from the school and at school-related extra-curricular activities, with very little time left for formal duties such as budgeting, scheduling, and instructional guidance. During the middle 1970s and 1980s, other researchers (Cawelti, 1982; Brookover et al., 1979; Rutter, 1979) also found that principals spent most of their time monitoring the school; interacting with students, staff, and parents; and not providing direct instructional leadership. Goodlad (1982) points out that "school administrators increasingly find themselves spending far more time on crises and complying with regulations than on curricular and instructional improvement." (Goodlad, 1982, p. 1)

On the other hand, one of the themes in the latest effective schools research centers around the importance of maintaining a positive social/school climate which fosters good teaching and effective learning. A corollary could be that a principal who maintains such an atmosphere is _indirectly_ providing instructional leadership. In a recent _Phi Delta_

Kappan article, Goodlad (1983) presents some personal recommendations from the findings of his in-depth study of 1,016 classrooms, A Study of Schooling (1984), and states that much more than direct instructional leadership is required for principals to carry out effective long-term school improvement plans. Goodlad (1983) reinforces the importance of a school leader's support, encouragement, and protection of teachers, students, and parents in the creation of a positive environment based upon teamwork. "As the principal and teachers become increasingly comfortable with one another, they will include on their agenda for dialog and action those most sensitive and central matters of teaching and curriculum that appear to be so resistant to change." (Goodlad, 1983, p. 556)

Whether one agrees that the central role of a school leader is to provide direct instructional leadership or indirect leadership support, there seems to be general agreement among education professionals that the principal sets the tone for the school while assuming the final responsibility for instruction and the allocation of resources to reach school goals. (Lipham, 1983; Cawelti, 1982; Brookover et al., 1979) Maintenance of a balance between management and instructional skills, combined with the ability to explain simultaneously district plans for improvement, establish educational practices at all levels, and develop a stable school atmosphere are included in the wide scope of administrators' duties and responsibilities, according to these researchers.

These same educational theorists, and many of their colleagues nationwide, write about the power of the principal and the superintendent to apply this complex combination of political and interpersonal skills and academic knowledge to make change and school improvements happen. While many of these theorists acknowledge the "contemporary challenge" which this ideal role definition represents for those who "live under the roof" of the school, many practitioners believe that researchers on the outside remain naive about how to influence what happens in schools. (Goodlad, 1984; Miller and Lieberman, 1982; Barth, 1981; Ourth, 1979) As noted earlier, principals and superintendents find that such a Renaissance view of their positions is out of touch with the realities of their day-to-day existence. Scholarly research and professional comment (Cawelti, 1982; Hoyle, 1981; Pellicer, 1981; Pitner, 1981) find a marked difference between the ideal role and the actual role of the principal.

In Georgia, this difference is illustrated in the findings of the PSC study _The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education_, September 1983, cited above:

> A marked difference emerged in the way principals ranked the roles with regard to current function and ideal function. Instructional leader was listed by 31% of the respondents as their most important _current_ role. However, 54.2% stated that their most important _ideal_ role was instructional leader. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the respondents listed being a school manager as their most important _current_ role. But only 9.4% stated that this should be their most important _ideal_ role. (PSC, 1983, p. 59)

Similarly, descriptive studies of how superintendents spend the majority of their time generate lists which include many of the same fragmented activities as those of principals. (Pitner, 1981; Dunigan, 1980; Bridges, 1977) Superintendents also spend the majority of their time giving and receiving information (primarily about noninstructional issues), responding to requests for action from an extensive network of individuals/groups, and in ceremonial activities and routine administrative tasks. These are described with adjectives such as "short," "discontinuous," "variable," "hectic," "unpredictable," "trivial," and "verbal" rather than "written." (Pitner, 1981) Thus, the superintendent feels similar pulls and constraints on his time and energies.

The next question to consider may be:

> How can both preservice and inservice preparation programs help principals and superintendents learn to better fulfill what they and the public perceive as their ideal roles, all the while acknowledging the contemporary realities of these demanding posts?

Fortunately, as described in the ensuing section, practicing administrators have very clear ideas about the skills development and practical information which they desire to help bring their actual and perceived roles together.

ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS: PROFESSIONAL VIEWS AND ASSESSMENTS

Nationally, principals and superintendents express some concern with the content, delivery, and relative usefulness of their formal preservice and inservice preparation programs. (It should be noted that this same criticism of professional training is present in many, if not most, occupations.) In Georgia, although the majority (70%) of the principals who responded to the 1983 Professional Standards Commission leadership study rated their preservice preparation highly, over one-half of the Georgia principals desired additional preparation in curriculum development, staff development, and teacher evaluation (cited earlier in this review, p. 10). One-third of the Georgia principals desired additional preparation in nearly all content areas related to the principalship. (PSC, 1983, pp. 60-62.)

These expressed needs and concerns of practitioners regarding professional training for administration seem to coincide with the last decade's public and professional emphases upon key leadership roles as critical for affecting qualitative school improvement. In effect, the preceding descriptive studies and research reports have shown that principals and superintendents are expected to possess complex managerial, instructional, and social skills both inside and outside the school. These are the same areas in which practitioners report a desire for more applicable preparation, whether preservice for prospective colleagues or their own continuing education, or through inservice efforts.

The work of Edwin Bridges is often cited concerning the topic of graduate leadership training programs, and he summarizes the dilemma surrounding professional leadership preparation as follows:

> Abstract knowledge about leadership, no matter how elegant it may be conceptually, will not suffice for a practicing administrator, especially when the effects of the spillover from the organization's "culture" can have an unanticipated impact upon the organization itself and the lives of all of its inhabitants. The persistent lack of a positive relationship between formal preparation and administrative effectiveness is not fictional, nor are the complaints about training that tumble from the lips of practitioners. Both the informal appraisals and the formal evidence suggest a pithy, albeit disconcerting, question, "To what extent, and in what precise ways, do our graduate leadership training programs prepare individuals to deal with the realities of leadership?"
>
> (Bridges, 1977, p. 213)

Principals, in response to some of these national surveys, both formal and informal, (Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977; Bridges and Baehr, 1971) mention many of the same problem areas concerning aspects of their academic preparation and inservice needs. A summary of some of the most often cited practitioner observations collected by these researchers follows. For purposes of analysis, comparisons are made between the work of the graduate student and the work of the actual school leader. Bridges and some of his colleagues (cited above) grouped the problem areas under the general categories of "the rhythm and hierarchical nature of work"; "the character of communications related to work"; and the "role of emotions in work." (Bridges, 1977) Others (Cawelti, 1982; Ourth, 1979) include practitioner observations relating to the mechanics of management and the application of instructional improvement strategies. A review of some of these formal and informal surveys (Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977; Bridges and Baehr, 1971) produced the following summary:

"Rhythm of Work" (Bridges, 1977)

Principals and superintendents indicate that some current university teaching methods and techniques are outdated and not keeping pace with the kinds of skills school administrators actually need in practice. (Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977) Examples include the need for rapid-fire communication (thinking on one's feet) as opposed to the quiet reflection and written expression characteristic of graduate study. (It appears that the 1980s demand for instant data has reduced time for thoughtful reflection.) (Bridges, 1977)

Based on their experience, many principals and superintendents are critical of their college course subject matter. They state that the course subject matter is seldom altered to reflect the real needs of practicing administrators; they want "pro-action skills" in conjunction with theory, educational history, and school law. (Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979) A common dilemma often cited is the problem of how to get things accomplished without the direct authority to do so. (Cawelti, 1982; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977)

"Role of Emotions in Work" (Bridges, 1977)

School administrators state that they would like more detailed and specific experience and training in human relations and "brokerage" skills, such as skill at building consensus among diverse viewpoints. These skills become especially necessary when an administrator is faced with the emotional dimensions of school life, such as frantic teachers, student and disciplinary problems, irate parents, and demanding school boards. (Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977) Skills needed to deal effectively with emotional turbulence are contrasted with the calm rationality required in academic discussions among graduate students and professors. In graduate school, clear presentation of ideas, not feelings, is the rule. (Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977)

"Character of Communications and the Mechanics of Management" (Bridges, 1977)

School administrators desire specific practice and skills in the area of formal public relations, i.e., effective communication and public speaking skills to aid them in positive school image-building. (Ourth, 1979) Georgia principals (45.7%) also expressed a desire for additional preparation in the development and maintenance of public relations. (PSC, 1983, p. 61)

Office management, especially time, is a nearly universal area of concern as expressed by school administrators. They need efficient written communication skills to respond within rapid turnaround time constraints, as opposed to the more leisurely read, study, and reflect, then write format of graduate school. Administrators also express a need for techniques to promote good working relationships in the office and efficient ways to deal with endless forms and central office paperwork. (Pitner, 1982; Cawelti, 1982; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977)

High on administrators' lists of their most difficult problem areas is the need for help in motivating teachers to accept new ideas and new strategies to better deal with discipline. (Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979)

Another study (Goldhammer, 1971) considered preservice training programs for elementary-level administrators. The primary researcher, Keith Goldhammer, quotes elementary-level school executives who also reported that their educational training programs were limited in content and methodology. These administrators concluded that, due to these limitations, their initial training had limited influence on their role performance. Goldhammer (1971) concluded that "on-the-job learning appears to be a major sources of influence on task performance." (Goldhammer, 1971, chap. 7) Goldhammer's sample of elementary-level administrators also identified six critical omission areas where elementary administrators considered their initial training lacking when contrasted with their actual needs:

> 1) Knowledge relating to goal setting, long range planning, and evaluation procedures;
> 2) Strategies for improvement and for assessing alternatives;
> 3) Group processes and communication skills;
> 4) Educational leadership;
> 5) Educational improvement through resource allocation; and
> 6) Human relations training.
>
> (Goldhammer, 1971, Chap. 7)

Approximately once every decade, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) conducts a major national study of the status and characteristics of the American school superintendency. The most recent study was conducted by Cunningham and Hentges (1982); their findings are reported in The American School Superintendency 1982. On the topic of professional preparation of superintendents, Cunningham and Hentges found that there has been a substantial change in the level of academic preparation of superintendents over the past ten years. The number of superintendents holding doctorates has risen from 15.4% a decade ago to 33.4% in 1982. (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 40) The size of school districts did make a difference in the highest earned degrees of superintendents; doctoral degrees were held far more often by superintendents in larger districts than by superintendents in smaller districts. The percentage of males and females with the doctorate is nearly the same. (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 56)

Over 80% of the superintendents in districts with 3,000 or more students rated their graduate programs as excellent or good, citing the quality of the professors as the major strength of the programs in which they participated. On the whole, the major weaknesses of graduate programs cited by the superintendents in the Cunningham and Hentges study were lack of time for full-time study and poor or irrelevant courses. The 1982 study also found a strengthened respect for educational research. About half (4[illegible].5%) of the superintendents said that educational research is "usually useful" or "highly useful," findings that Cunningham and Hentges (1982, p. 41) characterize as "reassuring given widespread commentary in the 1960s and 1970s about the irrelevancy of educational research." (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 57)

Superintendents in the same 1982 AASA study were asked what new skills or information they felt they needed to continue to be effective. Cunningham and Hentges (1982, p. 41) offer that this could be valuable data for those planning programs of graduate study or inservice education. Listed below are the areas superintendents cited in descending rank order, based on the study's National Weighted Profile:

- General management skills;
- Human relations skills;
- Data management/technology;
- Financial skills;
- Knowledge of social and education change processes;
- Other conflict resolution skills;
- Political skills; and
- Research skills.

(Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 41)

According to this survey, superintendents placed "relatively modest" weight upon the coverage of "issues and challenges" in university-based preservice curricula. Much stronger emphasis was placed on treating the "issues and challenges" through inservice. (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 42) Cunningham and Hentges found "no emphasis of self-satisfaction or retreat to a dependency upon current levels of training." (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 58)

When specific university coursework as part of preservice education was examined, this same study (AASA, 1982) found a similarity between the courses superintendents said they consider valuable and the challenges and issues facing the superintendency which they ranked as critical. Courses superintendents identified as of "importance" or of "great importance" were:

- human relations;
- personnel administration;
- public relations;
- school finance;
- school business management; and
- legal aspects of education.

(Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 57)

Cunningham and Hentges found that these courses correlate well with the issues and challenges the superintendents reported they currently face, such as:

- financing schools;
- staff and administrator evaluation; and
- negotiations and strikes.

(Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 57)

Gordon Cawelti, an educational researcher and practitioner who is currently serving as Executive Director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, has also collected information on the views of school administrators regarding their on-the-job needs as compared to their formal graduate preparation. (Cawelti, 1982) He and his colleagues informally surveyed principals and superintendents during the five years preceding his February 1982 article in Educational Leadership. From these surveys and through his years of experience, Cawelti (1982) has recorded that about 90% of these principals and superintendents cite "people problems" as their most difficult administrative area, not general goal problems. Indeed, only 10% of the administrators Cawelti and his colleagues surveyed identified their leadership problems as goal-related, as defined and expressed in phrases such as "no sense of direction," "priorities have not been established," and "everyone pulls in different directions." (Cawelti, 1982, p. 325) Cawelti commented upon these informal findings by noting that "rarely does a school leader mention improving achievement, reducing dropouts, improving school climate, or motivating student interest in important societal issues." (Cawelti, 1982, p. 325)

A review of the collective administrator observations cited in the surveys listed above (PSC, 1983; Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979; Bridges, 1977; Goldhammer, 1971) reveals a common theme. The new skills and/or information principals and superintendents feel they need in order to improve their personal effectiveness seem to center around specific "people problems" more often than the general qualitative improvement issues expressed by the public and documented in Boyer's High School and the Carnegie Foundation's A Nation at Risk. While this may appear to constitute a contradiction between principals, superintendents, and their publics, many educational researchers and practitioners (Goodlad, 1984; Boyer, 1983; Cawelti, 1982; Goldhammer, 1982; Pitner, 1981; Ourth, 1979) find it understandable. In the 1980s, school superintendents and principals, along with their college and university counterparts, find themselves consumed--virtually overwhelmed--with details of budgets, reporting, detailed accountability, reducing personnel, irate parents, dissatisfied students, and a frequently hostile public. Little time is left for goal setting and planning for the future. Managing survival and surviving decline have become nearly omnipresent. (Goodlad, 1984; The New York Times, 1984; Boyer, 1983)

John Goodlad, in the preface to his newest book, A Place Called School (Goodlad, 1984), sees the beginning of an upturn in this widespread disaffection with schooling in the United States and hope for beleaguered administrators:

> The change in mood may stem from little more than the belief that conditions in our schools have bottomed out. The only way to go now is up. But there are some reasons to take heart. Time is giving us a more appreciative perspective on the burdens carried by schools in recent years, burdens increasingly taken in stride. Test scores are holding their own or even turning around in some states, especially at the primary level. School administrators, board members, and parent groups in some communities are becoming aware that they must join together if schools are to be improved. Recent conferences of educators, parents, and policy makers addressing issues of schooling have been both well attended and marked with a spirit of optimism. And there are signs that educational administrators, recently fully preoccupied with crises, are turning their attention increasingly to curricular and instructional reform. (Goodlad, 1984, Preface)

This dichotomy between the actual performance constraints of administrators and the needs perceived by outside forces pushing for accountability forms a focus for educational planners striving to improve university preservice and administrator inservice preparation. Questions which surface are: What mix of content and procedure, theory and practice, scholarly research and practical field study, technical skills and human relations development will educate and train administrators to be all things to all people? What combination of skill-building and technical information will equip school administrators with a complete set of tools for use in bringing their actual and perceived roles together?

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS: A GENERAL PROFILE

Typical Program Characteristics

Across the nation, graduate training for school administrators is offered on three levels--the Master's, intermediate (educational specialist degree and state certification), and doctoral degree levels. Colleges of Education are responsible for providing these degree programs in administration and supervision. In general, Departments of Educational Administration within the Colleges of Education decide upon the orientation of the program (i.e., what balance of conceptual, human relations, and technical skills), the curriculum content, the methods and delivery of instruction, the composition of the faculty, and departmental requirements for entrance (including student selection and recruitment), and degree completion. Most departments attempt to coordinate their program offerings and competency requirements with those specified by their State Departments of Education for administrator certification at the various levels.

Davis and Spuck (1978), in a comprehensive national study of preparatory programs for educational administrators at all three degree levels, provide a "typical" program profile and some observations concerning staffing in Departments of Educational Administration which may be useful as a reference point or backdrop to a review. Although the program characteristics collected by Davis and Spuck (1978) are general and were compiled six years ago, it is the overall consensus of the researcher/practitioners reviewed (Cornett, 1983; Hoyle, 1983; Piper, 1983; Pitner, 1982; Davis and Spuck, 1978) and the Directors of the national professional associations surveyed by telephone for this review* that most college and university educational administration degree programs today are traditional in content and structure. [*NOTE: A list of the association Directors interviewed for this review is contained in the "Parameters of this Study," (p. 95, this review)]

The traditional program information which follows is summarized from "Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States" (Paula F. Silver and Dennis W. Spuck, eds., 1978), a report compiled and reported under the auspices of The University Council for Educational Administration.

'Typical' Educational Administration Program Profile

1. The orientation of the program is toward conceptual, human relations, and technical skills in about equal proportions.
2. Students are attracted to the program because of its convenient location.
3. The major admission requirement for students is a minimum grade point average in undergraduate studies.
4. The program offers 42 credits, with 75% of them in course work and 25% in field and/or research experiences. Students take 32 credits to complete the program.
5. Of the required courses, 65% are in educational administration, 25% are elsewhere in the college of education, and 10% are outside the college of education.
6. Class time is spent with between 10 and 30 students in discussion.

> 7. Although there is no residency requirement, students meet with an advisor at least once per quarter or semester.
> 8. The program is perceived to be current, relevant and useful, and the courses are felt to be interrelated.
> 9. There is much faculty-student communication within the program but little innovativeness or individualization.
> 10. Research and statistics courses are required.
> 11. Facilities and services are highly rated.
> 12. There have been recent changes in program content and instructional processes, and changes in these areas are projected for the future.
>
> (Silver and Spuck, 1978, pp. 53-54)

Donald Piper, Professor and Chairperson of Educational Administration at the University of North Dakota, has completed the most recent (1983) summary of current information about selected characteristics, activities, and requirements found in graduate programs in educational administration in the United States. He presented the information gathered from the 120 institutions (in 38 states) which responded to his questionnaire at the August 8, 1983, National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA). His purpose was to provide a common framework for the week-long conference discussions on the general theme of "Programs in Educational Administration--Focus on Survival." The following is a summary of some of Piper's observations indicated by these recent (1983) data from the 120 departments of educational administration responding to his questionnaire. Of the 120 institutions, 11 offered the Master's degree only, 47 offered the Master's and Specialist/Certification programs, and 62 offered programs through the Doctorate. (Piper, 1983, p. 2)

1983 National Educational Administration Program Profile
(Piper, 1983)

Degrees Offered:

The MS/MA is much more common in Master's-only institutions, but the M.Ed. is slightly more common in Specialist/Certification and Doctorate institutions. Certification programs are much more common than Specialist programs in Specialist/Certification institutions, but Specialist programs are somewhat more common in Doctorate institutions. Ed.D. programs are much more common than Ph.D. programs in Doctorate institutions--85% offer the Ed.D. and 55% offer the Ph.D.

Enrollment Changes (Master's):

Nearly half of the Doctorate institutions report decreases in Master's enrollments, but only 9% of the Master's-only institutions and 24% of the Specialist/Certification institutions report decreases. Piper surmises that Master's enrollments are shifting away from Doctorate institutions to Master's-only and Specialist/Certification institutions.

Enrollment Changes (Specialist/Certification):

Specialist/Certification enrollments appear to be shifting away from Doctorate institutions to Specialist/Certification institutions, but this change does not appear to be nearly as dramatic as the shift in the Master's enrollments.

Enrollment Changes (Doctorate):

Doctorate enrollments are increasing in more than half of the institutions and declining in only 13% of them.

Positions for Which Students Are Preparing:

Ninety-two percent (92%) of the students in Master's-only institutions and 84% of the students in Specialist/Certification institutions are preparing for positions as secondary or elementary administrators. In Doctorate institutions these two positions account for 55% of the students. Enrollments in Doctorate institutions are evenly split (27%, 27%, and 28%, respectively) among the three positions of superintendent or central office administrator, secondary administrator, and elementary administrator. Only 6% of the students are preparing for the professorship or administration in higher education.

Teaching Methodologies Used:

Lecture-discussion in class settings is used approximately one-half (48%) of the time in all three levels of institutions. Small group discussion constitutes (20%) of class time, and the remaining time is split somewhat evenly (10%, 20%, and 10%, respectively) among simulation/role playing, individual/group research, and internship/field-based practicum. Piper found a consistency of responses across all three levels of institutions; the only notable difference was that individual/group research could be expected less often in Master's-only institutions than in the other two levels of institutions.

Residency Requirements:

A residency is required for the Master's in less than one-third (32%) of the institutions and for the Specialist in less than one-half (45%) of the institutions. However, Piper notes, these figures are misleading because many of the institutions report that this "residency" really is a requirement to complete a certain minimum number of credits within a certain time period; it is not actually a full-time residency. In contrast, nearly all (95%) of the institutions offering the Doctorate do require a residency--and this is a full-time residency.

Internship:

For students who do not have administrative experience, the internship is required in 79% of the institutions; for students who do have administrative experience, the internship is required in 51% of the institutions. All or virtually all of the students (90% or more) take an internship in 65 (54%) of the institutions; the overall average of students taking internships is 72%.

Program Course Patterns:

The most common pattern reported for all institutions (55%) is core courses for all students with additional courses varying, although Piper notes that this pattern is much less common in Master's-only institutions than in the other two levels. The second most common pattern (a distant second found in 18% of the institutions) is separate core courses for students seeking each position with additional courses varying. A very common pattern in doctoral institutions is to have Master's and Specialist/Certification programs built on a common core with additional core courses arranged by position goal (district level, secondary, elementary) and the remainder of the courses individualized on an elective basis. Where this pattern exists, the Doctorate program only is often highly individualized.

> NCATE approved:
>
> More than three-fourths (77%) of the programs are approved by NCATE (Doctorate=89%, Specialist/Certification programs=66%, Master's=54%).
>
> (Piper, 1983, pp. 2-4)

Issues and Trends

This review has reported the existence of mixed opinions on the usefulness and quality of traditional college and university preservice programs for administrators. Research findings discussed earlier (pp. 18-27, this review) noted that, although school administrators cite the major strength of their preservice preparation as the quality of the professors, they also cite the major weaknesses as: a) a lack of student time for full-time study; and b) poor or irrelevant courses. The overriding complaint of practitioners is that they find a major discrepancy between the formal preparation they received and what they actually do on the job. Practitioners regret that their university training did not provide the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge in actual school administration, that much of the theory presented in graduate school was tangential to today's educational needs, and that practitioners were rarely used in teaching and course development. (Cornett, 1983; Hoyle, 1983, 1981; Cunningham and Hentges, 1982; Pitner, 1982, p. 18; Ourth, 1979; Wolcott, 1973)

These practitioner criticisms have been a catalyst for discussion and reassessment of all aspects of administrator preparation in colleges and universities, state and local school boards, and principals and superintendents themselves.

Topics of collegial discussion include general issues such as: a) student selection/recruitment, and assessment; b) student time constraints which affect program delivery and residency requirements; c) general degree requirements, including exit criteria; and d) the composition of faculty in educational administration. Other discussion items which surfaced as part of this review deal with greater flexibility in programming, including active student and practitioner participation in real and/or simulated school settings, and more varied teaching methodologies, including cases, simulations, games, and multimedia materials. (Piper, 1983; Pitner, 1982; McIntyre, 1979; Davis and Spuck, 1978; Farquhar, 1977, 1973; Culbertson et al., 1969)

This review of administrator preparation programs also discovered programmatic responses in some colleges and universities which have begun new movements in the field of educational administration, some incorporating substantive reorganization of the entire approach to administrator preservice and inservice preparation. Some of the innovations in present-day administrator preparation programs utilize cooperative university/school district efforts such as practitioner participation in education and training. Others use various combinations of discipline-based content and practice-based content. There is evidence that new programs such as these for novice administrators as well as continuing education for experienced principals and superintendents are beginning to multiply, state by state and university by university. (Hoyle, telephone interview, 1984; interviews with Executive Directors of various national education organizations, 1984, as part of a pyramid study for this review; and Pitner, 1982.)

The material which follows offers an overview of the issues and concerns expressed most often in the research literature on educational administration, including some professional comment from a sample of researcher/practitioners identified as contributing to some of the most effective degree programs nationwide. (See "Parameters of This Study" section of this review, pp. 95-99) This information also corresponds to the current discussion issues surrounding the field of educational administration listed previously--students, faculty, and program. In addition, examples of some contemporary trends in program responses are included. Researcher/practitioners such as Hoyle, 1983; McCleary, 1983, 1973; Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1982, 1981; and McIntyre, 1979; offer some general program guidelines within each topic area, based upon their collective experience and professional exchange with colleagues at work in other effective degree programs. These researchers present their views with the caveat that different groups of planners compile different program elements relevant to their individual school settings, student needs and characteristics, and the educational philosophies of their faculties.

Kenneth McIntyre, in a 1979 article on training programs for principals in Theory Into Practice, summarizes two major studies of preparation programs for school administrators and provides detail relating to the "recent changes in program content and instructional processes" listed in #12 of the Silver and Spuck (1978) profile. McIntyre compiled a capsule review of the major program delivery components found in both the UCEA Commission Report on the Preparation and Certification of Educational Administrators (1973), which dealt with trends beginning prior to 1960, and Silver's (1974) study of the program delivery components during the period from 1969 to 1974. McIntyre's review is useful in conjunction with the 1978 Silver and Spuck survey information. When compared to the recent program descriptions obtained from the national sample reviewed in this study, McIntyre's (1979) summary continues to reflect many of the apparent trends in the delivery of preservice training. McIntyre's summary of the UCEA and Silver studies includes the following programmatic trends:

> 1. Toward stating the purpose of preparation in more specific and operational terms, including "competency-based" terminology, and toward more clearly defined program structure;
> 2. Toward increased utilization of other departments, such as the social and behavioral sciences, the humanities, and business administration;
> 3. Toward increased specialization, for such fields as higher education administration and such emerging roles as those of negotiators;
> 4. Toward greater flexibility in programming;
> 5. Toward expanded talent pools from which administrators are recruited, such as ethnic minorities and women;
> 6. Toward increased field experiences, such as internships; and
> 7. Toward more varied methodology, including cases, simulations, games, and multimedia materials.
>
> (McIntyre, 1979, p. 30)

Student Selection/Recruitment

This review of research literature has found that information regarding student populations--the nature of students served--also can be helpful when considering program evaluation and future program planning for contemporary graduate programs in administration and supervision. Just as there are many performance constraints involved in the workaday world of the school principal and superintendent, research and experience (Pitner, 1982; Silver and Spuck, 1978; Culbertson et al., 1969) indicate that limited graduate student time flexibility strongly influences preservice program delivery as well. In addition, the particular personal motivations and educational philosophies of the students participating in the program, combined with the school setting in which they often work while completing graduate study, also shape coursework emphasis and the depth of content explored. Supplementary to the "typical" program profile (Silver and Spuck, 1978) included earlier, (pp. 29-30, this review) are the following graduate student characteristics and degree program responses inherent in the field of study called educational administration:

- Most students are part-time;
- Most attempt to maintain full employment; and therefore;
- Teaching is of necessity scheduled in late afternoons, evenings, or weekends;
- Residency requirements are rarely enforced; and
- Students are self-selected, that is, while working as middle-level school administrators, or after some teaching experience, they decide to pursue a

> graduate degree and certification as a higher level administrator.
> (Silver and Spuck, 1978; Culbertson et al., 1969)

The same UCEA study (Silver and Spuck, 1978) showed that, nationally, the largest numbers of students in Master's programs in educational administration were preparing for principalships, assistant principalships, and building-level supervisor positions. Eighty-two percent (82%) were preparing to enter public school administration immediately, and 11% were planning further study.

The last student characteristic listed above, student "self-selection" into preservice training, is viewed as a critical issue by a number of contemporary researcher/practitioners. (McCleary, 1984; Hoyle, 1983; Pitner, 1982; McIntyre, 1979; Haskins, 1978) One of the major differences between inservice and preservice training is that administrators participating in inservice have already been selected by some method, while preservice training offers the opportunity to consider student selection as a major component of the program. McIntyre, Haskins, and their colleagues listed above believe that the selection process should be at two levels: the first would involve some type of counseling before a student enters the program; the second would entail periodic evaluation of the people who continue in the program to determine whether they can handle the principalship or superintendency. (McIntyre, 1979; Haskins, 1978) McIntyre (1979) concurs with Haskins and states:

> If we buy the proposition that the school principalship is a complex, tough, and demanding job that not everybody with a college degree could successfully

> handle, then we should look honestly at the record of the training institutions in the United States, insofar as the recruitment and selection of future school principals is concerned. (McIntyre, 1979, p. 28)

Some of the preservice preparatory programs included in this review (the Universities of Utah, Texas at Austin, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Texas A&M, Columbia Teachers College, Georgia State University, and Georgia Southern College) have applied this two-level approach to selection and initial training of prospective school administrators. These programs make use of an introductory general course experience in educational administration in which new students' aptitudes, leadership potentials, and critical thinking skills are both nurtured and assessed by the professors, fellow students, and the individual student himself. Some programs, such as the one at the University of Utah-Salt Lake City, utilize formal assessment instruments such as the NASSP Assessment Center materials currently in use nationwide. Such instruments attempt to identify and measure managerial and administrative potential. Lynn Cornett, in a Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) monograph entitled The Preparation and Selection of School Principals (1983), theorizes that

> if assessment center techniques that relate behavioral characteristics to the effectiveness of the school principal prove fruitful, processes could be set in place in the educational administration programs to counsel those who might not be suited for the principal's job into other types of administrative work.
> (Cornett, 1983, p. 14)

Paula Silver (1978) conducted a national research study of the trends in preservice program development in educational administration from 1974-1978. Respondents to her study were

439 professors, representing 327 departments and including 212 department chairpersons--a sample which represents 88% of all departments of educational administration in the United States. (Silver, 1978, p. 180) Changes in recruitment, selection, or admission procedures were reported by professors in 209 institutions. Higher admission standards, a category which included requiring more letters of recommendation and/or letters from district-based administrators, requiring higher Graduate Record Examination (GRE) or Miller's Analogy Test (MAT) scores, and instituting pre-admission interviews (counseling) were reported most often, according to Silver. (1978, p. 186)

More stringent admission standards are attempts by some university program planners to determine more effectively if the people admitted to graduate study in educational administration will be good practitioners as well as competent in the theoretical subjects. These movements also are in response to current public concerns regarding the caliber of some school leaders--alumni of degree programs in educational administration. Haskins (1978) believes that universities should certainly admit all students who wish to study but notes that "the trouble occurs when completion of university courses becomes tantamount to certification that the graduate is prepared to practice in a certain profession." (Haskins, 1978, p. 40)

Residency

The question of residency appears both in the research literature and upon examination of newly restructured preservice programs. Many of these program planners (McCleary, 1984; Hoyle, 1983; McIntyre, 1979; and Mann, 1976) support the notion of a full-time residency, and some programs require a residency, even though it is expensive for the individual who must take a leave of absence to do it. Other programs make use of a summer session in residence, but the benefit of studying and practicing administrative skills while schools are in session is lost. There seems to be general consensus among the "occupational experts"--the scholars, practitioners, professors, and those recently graduated students of educational administration (Hoyle, 1983; McCleary, 1983; Pitner, 1983; McIntyre, 1979; and Mann, 1976)--that a program based solely upon "drop-in" courses offered after school or on Saturdays does not prepare a individual to become a good administrator.

Faculty in Educational Administration

The educational training and philosophy of the faculty in any university department is also central to the quality and the nature of the content inherent in its educational programs. According to Culbertson et al (1969), programs in educational administration have unique concerns in this area as evidenced by the high proportion of senior faculty within the professoriate. Culbertson et al. (1969, p. 199) believe that this is due to the nature of an applied field and beliefs regarding the value of both theory and practice:

> The staffing of a university department for the primary purpose of professional preparation, however, involves special problems which are not experienced in

> staffing other university divisions. These problems result primarily from the dual need to secure staff expertise both in the competencies of the profession for which the students are being prepared and in the disciplines from which content is drawn for the preparatory program. . . . There is evidence that public school experience is seen by those who employ professors of educational administration as an important requirement for appointment to professorships. . . . The longer period of teaching and administrative experience, which is required of most candidates for professorships in educational administration (as compared with professors in most other subject specializations), is apparently viewed by most of those responsible for appointments as having certain advantages from the standpoint of teaching and field contacts.
>
> (Culbertson et al., 1969, p. 199)

Some theorists (Farquhar, 1977) have expressed concern that, given the older age and experience of educational administration faculty, the teaching of administration may tend to be frozen in time. The educational practices of a time of richer resources and administrative experience in the 1950s and early 1960s do not relate well to inadequate resources, higher stress, teacher frustrations, and the inner city crises of the 1980s. (Boyer, 1983; Hoyle, 1981) Some of the superintendents cited in a large study conducted by Goldhammer expressed concern that departments of educational administration are staffed by "too many former superintendents who 'have retreated to the university.'" (in Culbertson et al., 1969, p. 199) The departmental response to this criticism (as documented by Goldhammer) was to strive for more of a balance between administration in practice and current educational theory and research. (Culbertson et al., 1969, p. 199) Often, this goal has been reflected in a similar search for balance in the professorial talents of a department of educational administration.

An example of such a balance, according to Culbertson (1969), is a departmental team of four or five professors in which a continuum of interests and expertise is represented. These professorial abilities may range from the analytical skills of the social scientist at one point to the artistic talents of the practitioner at the other. (Culbertson et al., 1969, p. 200) Farquhar (1969) reported that another tendency in departmental staffing is toward the addition of

> relatively young professors who are short on administrative experience but long on training in the social sciences, competency in research, or specialization in such emergent content areas as systems analysis, intergovernmental relationships, and planning technologies. (Farquhar, 1969, p. 12)

The issue of female representation on faculties in departments of educational administration could comprise the focus of another study. Currently, research is emerging which some believe indicates male/female differences in administrative styles and philosophical approaches to the teaching and practice of administration in education. (Pitner, in press) In a 1972 study, Campbell and Newell sampled 1333 professors of educational administration, of whom only 2% were female. (Silver and Spuck, 1978, p. 41) Four years later, Silver and Spuck reported that the percentage of female professors in educational administration had increased from the 2% in 1972 to approximately 10% in 1976. (Silver and Spuck, 1978, p. 41)

A 1982-83 statistic for comparative purposes currently is not available. Telephone interviews with national researcher/statisticians at The Chronicle of Higher Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, and a private national survey group in Boulder, Colorado, all indicate that such "census" data indicating the number of professors in various academic disciplines, nationally, by sex, are very difficult to collect. Silver and Spuck (1978) also acknowledge that in their 1976 study the responses received in answer to a question which categorized instructional staff by sex were either nonexistent or inaccurate. Thus, it was not possible to determine the "true percentage of female professors" in the 258 departments surveyed through the UCEA study; however, rough estimates of the percentage could be computed. (Silver and Spuck, 1978, p. 39)

Proportionally fewer women occupy senior ranks than junior ranks in the whole of academe. The same is true in departments of educational administration. The rough estimates from the UCEA survey showed 20% of all assistant professors of educational administration were women while only 13% of the associate professors and 4% of the full professors in 1976 were women. (Silver and Spuck, 1978, p. 39) Compared to all of academe in 1974-75, women faculty members represented 16.6% of the total. In 1983, this percentage (women full-time faculty nationwide) has dropped dramatically, according to the most recent statistics collected by the National Center for Education Statistics. During the 1982-83 academic year, the number of full-time instructional faculty (on nine and twelve month contracts) was 111,782. Women faculty in 1982-83 totalled 11,965, or 10.7% of the total number of full-time faculty nationwide. (Telephone interview with Norman Brandt, National Center for Education Statistics, June 22, 1984)

Practitioner Involvement in Instruction

The limitations of administrator certification based primarily upon graduate classroom experiences are beginning to diminish, according to many theorists and practitioners (McCleary, 1984, 1973; Hoyle, 1983; Pellicer, 1982) as agreement grows concerning the importance of supplementing passive classroom discussion with active practice components. The classic administration program of twenty years ago assumed that aspiring administrators emerged from the classroom understanding not only the techniques of human motivation and the processes for implementing instructional strategies, but also all of the leadership skills discussed earlier in this review (pp. 19-23, this review). Some educational planners in the 1980s are beginning to realize that this assumption may be an oversimplification of a very complex task.

A prominent educational theorist and active practitioner in the development and delivery of both preservice and inservice administrator preparation is John Hoyle of Texas A&M University. Dr. Hoyle served as the 1982 American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Professor and, in that role, was charged with the direction and development of new AASA guidelines for influencing administrator preparation programs and professional enrichment activities. In an article entitled

"Administering Learning Environments in the Twenty-First Century" (1981), Dr. Hoyle asks "Are educational leaders ready for the twenty-first century?":

> Are they prepared to administer learning environments in a different kind of world? In all but a very few graduate programs in educational administration, the answer is no. Most graduate programs in the country offer the Master's degree with a traditional certification component. These programs consist of "nuts and bolts" or "heat, light and ventilation" courses required for state licensure for administration. Practical "how to" experiences are important to a fledgling administrator but not to the exclusion of more generic, future-oriented components. Doctoral programs in educational administration, while claiming to be theory based and to emphasize planning, research, and management of change, often are repeats of a higher level certification complete with "practical skills" for the schools of today.
>
> (Hoyle, 1981, p. 251)

Hoyle believes it is necessary to study educational administration the way John Goodlad, in a Phi Delta Kappan article entitled, "What We Don't Know About Schooling" (May, 1980), looks at the study of schools: [according to Goodlad] ". . . we study learning and teaching but only recently have we begun to study schools holistically." (Hoyle, 1981, p. 251) Practical, on-the-job skills must be balanced with learning of a broader nature. Educational leaders must acquire the tools to anticipate the future. They must do more than merely respond to the immediacy of the present. (Hoyle, 1981)

When all these "musts" and "shoulds" combine, a picture emerges of an approach to a contemporary educational program for prospective school administrators. There is general agreement in the research literature that a degree program in educational administration should include broad content areas such as: organizational behavior and development; policy studies; decision making; human relationships; leadership; instructional improvement; management science; and school law. (Hoyle, 1983; Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1981; McIntyre, 1979; McCleary, 1973)

Internships/Field Experiences

However, in response to the calls of practitioners and educational researchers for more "hands-on training," several schools of education are creating programs solidly grounded in theory, but which also include more practicality. One approach has been to reach back into the undergraduate curriculum and borrow an idea that is time proven--"practice teaching." Just as neophyte teachers practice teaching under the watchful eyes of their professors and a classroom instructor, neophyte administrators can also practice administration through internships or various forms of field experiences under the watchful eyes of their professors and practicing administrators. Cornett (1983) supports the internship provided it is offered in full cooperation with school districts. Cornett also cites instructional approaches used in some degree programs which include some of the knowledge-based work best taught in the university setting and more practical courses taught in conjunction with practicing administrators. (These types of programs presently are active at the University of Utah-Salt Lake City, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, University of Texas-Austin, and Columbia Teachers College, to name a few.)

Cornett (1983) concurs with many research/practitioners reviewed (Hoyle, 1983; Pitner, 1982; McIntyre, 1979; Haskins, 1978) and acknowledges that both of these approaches (internships and professor/practitioner team-teaching) depend upon the willingness of the colleges to modify existing faculty reward structures to include field work, along with flexibility in programs to recognize experiences provided by other than formal college faculty. Current debates concerning the nature and quality of field experiences and increased practitioner involvement in degree programs center around the inherent problems versus the student benefits. Problems cited most often (McCleary, 1984, 1973; Cornett, 1983; Hoyle, 1983; Pitner, 1982) are: the additional expense, time, and staff requirements when compared to regular classroom programs; possible conflicts between host administrators and university supervisors; and the belief that ultimate success rests with the level of commitment demonstrated by the participating school district. The same researchers cite much student enthusiasm with field experiences. McIntyre (1979) learned of these positive reactions after participating as a member of a research team which studied sixty of the most effective senior high school principals in the United States. The team asked these exemplary principals what they would recommend concerning preservice and inservice training for their positions. McIntyre reports this "extremely clear message" as their collective response:

> For preservice training, the internship was by far the most favored program element. As for methodology, the terms "relevance" and "reality-oriented" were used numerous times, and in-basket exercises and simulations were specifically mentioned by several.
> (McIntyre, 1979, p. 32)

Active supervision and guidance in both settings--in the classroom and in the field--can provide students with important dual evaluation, and the student feedback allows for more individualized instruction based upon a shared analysis of individual student competencies and needs. Cornett (1983) surmises that "educational administration programs are likely to become more relevant to challenges faced by school administrators if faculty members have been directly involved in the schools." She recommends that "programs need to be developed to address the strengths and weaknesses of the individual candidates, so they are not just a series of courses." (Cornett, 1983, p. 14) Pitner (1981) agrees that such "reality-based" programs provide an opportunity for students to experience a balance of learning about and learning how, rooted in a solid foundation of learning why. (Pitner, 1981, p. 4)

Lloyd McCleary, of the University of Utah-Salt Lake City, directed the National High School Principal Study sponsored by NASSP which was completed in 1979 (cited earlier in this review). A supporter of field-based preparation and linkages between the university and school districts, McCleary cautions against making only positive generalizations about the learning that occurs in competency-based programs or through internships; this caveat is echoed by Pitner (1982). According to

McCleary, "There is the too common practice, particularly in the internship, of conceiving the experience to be the content. Rather, the experience should serve as the application or illustration of the content." (McCleary, 1984, p. 9) With this precept in mind, McCleary supports well conceived and well executed field-based components of administrator preparation. University degree programs need the active field connection as a basis of inquiry, as arenas for validation of their program effectiveness (when trainees are successful), as support--material, moral, and political. (McCleary, 1984, p. 12)

McCleary (1984) and his colleagues (Hoyle, 1983; Silver, 1983; Pitner, 1982; McIntyre, 1979) agree that the material, moral, and political support is supplied when degree programs serve the broader needs of the profession by contributing to a professional knowledge base, and, conversely, this support structure is damaged when the outside perception is one of university isolation and limited contribution.

University/School District Articulation/Implications for Administrator Inservice

Pitner (1981) calls for a careful integration of the efforts of both university faculty and practicing administrators in the development and delivery of contemporary curriculum and instruction for administrator preservice and inservice programs. Throughout this review, the suggestions of Pitner and some of her colleagues, such as John Hoyle, Kenneth McIntyre, Gordon Cawelti, Lloyd McCleary, and Keith Goldhammer, have been presented not as specific curricular prescriptions--the province of individual faculties--but more as elements of a possible structure within which to consider and resolve debate on the most useful content and the most effective means of delivering administrator education and training.

Summarized, the three elements of this structure for discussion are: 1) the content of administrator training must be reexamined and the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes that should be learned need to be identified and agreed upon; 2) the scope and sequence of administrator training need to be specified and possibly altered to reflect contemporary situations; and 3) the entire field of educational administration, including the professional organizations and practitioners, needs to come together and identify "which information, skills, habits, concepts, or explanations should be learned in one setting over another." (Pitner, 1982, pp. 46-7)

Element #1 above, the content of administrator training, can be reexamined in light of the information reviewed earlier in this study comparing actual administrator work with the needs and expectations of the students, teachers, and the public at large. Element #2, the scope and sequence of training, pertains to the timing of learning about being a school leader. A recurrent theme throughout this review, stated by both students and alumni (practitioners) of degree programs in administration, has been the continuing educational needs of administrators at different points and/or transitions in their careers. Pitner (1982) frames the problem this way:

> We need to decide not only in what order the content should be presented but also at what time--before the administrative career begins, during the initial years in the role, during an activity of disengagement (e.g., doctoral program or retreat), or during career transitions (e.g., promotions or retirements).
> (Pitner, 1982, p. 49)

Collaboration in the delivery of instruction to prospective and practicing administrators is the subject of Element #3 above. Earlier in this review of administrator attitudes toward their work and their formal preparation for certification, some practitioners claimed that a) their academic preparation left them unprepared for the realities of managerial work; b) they appreciated the opportunity to apply theory to practice in actual school settings; and c) they saw value in complementing university faculty perspectives with those of practicing administrators. In response, many researcher/practitioners (McCleary, 1984; Hoyle, 1983; Pitner, 1982; Goldhammer, 1982; Cawelti, 1982) call for joint discussion and resolution within the entire field concerning who should have responsibility for what content, in what settings, and in what sequence. The following suggestion from the Pitner (1981) study is an example of collaboration involving all three elements:

> . . . a student might spend the summer at the university taking administration courses in the (theoretical) domain and during the school year participate in workshops which provide a conscious articulation between theory and practice or train administrators in less cognitive, skill-oriented material relevant to the position for which certification is sought. Graduate credit would be earned in all cases.
> (Pitner, 1981, p. 9)

The concept of ongoing, cooperative instructional efforts creates a view of preservice training which coincides with a majority of researcher/practitioners in educational administration. (Hoyle, 1983; Pellicer, 1982; Pitner, 1982; Cawelti, 1982) This view is based upon the belief that the completion of any degree program in educational administration is only a beginning.

Along with the growing requirement for continuing education in professional fields such as law and accounting, education also asks its administrators to remain current through active inservice training. Hoyle and Pitner agree that it is time for philosophical and territorial debates to cease and cooperation to begin: ". . . [universities] must identify what they do best and do it." (Hoyle, 1983, p. 5; Pitner, 1982, p. 52)

James March, a prominent theoretician and scholar who has long studied the field of leadership, addressed the annual National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration in August of 1973, where he made a similar plea for university action over a decade ago. March supported the notion that the university does more than teach vocational skills. According to March, universities should concentrate on the things they do well:

- Management training;
- Basic knowledge;
- Identifying general problems;
- Isolating and providing broad experience in the necessary and intellectual skills;
- Discussing value issues;
- Encouraging risk-taking and initiative;

- Building social and personal sensitivity;
- Exposure to conflicting ideas and sentiments;
- Building a sense of self-esteem; and
- Development of new knowledge and its implications.

(March, 1973, p. 4)

Other educators (Hoyle, 1983; Pellicer, 1982; Pitner, 1982; Farquhar, 1972; Culbertson, 1969) concur with March theoretically. Pitner (1982) believes that March's stress upon the intellective domain as the advantage of university training of administrators is important for at least two reasons:

> First, it suggests that some training may be carried out in nonuniversity settings and by people other than professors. Second, it describes the response of practitioners to their perceived gap in knowledge and skills, or what they term "being unprepared and meeting the growing challenges of their profession."
>
> (Pitner, 1982, p. 27)

Therefore, Pitner and many of her colleagues organize their suggestions for effective administrator preparation around the identification of what can best be taught in the university classroom and what can be learned in other settings, such as internships and field experiences; clinical training strategies such as competency-based training, summer academies, and workshops; and other university/school district cooperative ventures.

Several approaches to administrator preservice preparation have been developed which attempt to balance classroom knowledge with supervised field experience in educational administration. A brief review of the rationale, content, and delivery of some of these contemporary programs may be helpful to those contemplating administrator certification revisions in their school systems and/or their formal preservice degree programs. Many of the degree programs summarized in the Appendix have been identified as exemplary by nationally respected experts in school administration and the directors of national educational organizations and were included within this review of school administrator preparation programs in states other than Georgia.

PRESERVICE PREPARATION FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: VARIOUS APPROACHES

Nationwide, educational researchers interested in the improvement of the formal education and professional training of school leaders have dedicated their professional lives to working with other "occupational experts." Their collective goal has been the development of more effective and relevant preservice and inservice experiences for promising potential as well as practicing school administrators. Four of the many researcher/practitioners who were mentioned most often by their colleagues in educational administration and by national directors of professional educational organizations (see "Parameters of This Study" section) are: Keith Goldhammer, former Dean of the College of Education and professor of administration and higher education at Michigan State University; John Hoyle, Texas A&M University and the 1982 AASA Professor assigned to revise the AASA Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators; Lloyd McCleary, Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Utah-Salt Lake City; and Paula Silver, of the University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign. Each of these people is immersed in the study, formulation, and application of various approaches to the preparation and professional development of school leaders for the 1980s and beyond.

Some of the preparatory programs they represent are more traditional in content and teaching procedures, but house distinguished faculty involved in current research on a national scale. Other programs employ faculty active in the evaluation and field-testing of innovations in administrator preservice and inservice training. These faculty also are working with their colleagues to restructure their own programs in cooperation with adjacent public schools systems. The administration program at Michigan State University in which Keith Goldhammer is a professor was not included in this national sample. However, Goldhammer's extensive publications and activity in educational research and leadership training prompted many of the professional sources contacted to recommend his research and expertise for study. He and Paula Silver present more theoretical approaches to the teaching of educational administration, and are included as thought pieces for possible use in collegial considerations of preparatory program assessment and possible curriculum development.

Brief summaries of these four individual approaches to programs in educational administration are presented. Included are some aspects of the theoretical and experiential rationales each researcher/practitioner used while developing programmatic applications in their particular school and university settings. Additional information concerning their programs in practice and a sample of others which surfaced during the course of this study are included in the Appendix.

Approach One: Keith Goldhammer
Six Key Elements

Keith Goldhammer is Professor of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University. To lend some contextual background to his views on contemporary leadership training, Goldhammer (1982) begins with a brief review of the recent history of educational administration preparation in the United States. Summarized, some of the pertinent historical junctures are included here.

Thirty years ago, shortly after the conclusion of World War II, the central focus of most preparatory programs for school administrators was community leadership. Prospective administrators were encouraged to become better equipped to understand and work with all facets of community life. Following this initial emphasis, professors of administration made an effort to establish a professional knowledge base. Ideas and perspectives were added from organizational theory, management, behavioral science research, and experience from other fields, including the humanities. As with other areas in the growing field of administrative sciences, educators developed various rationale to guide administrative practice in concert with sound theory and evidence. (Goldhammer, 1982)

Goldhammer (1982) observes that a post World War II "spirit of inquiry" in education in general provoked the interest of behavioral scientists in the field of research in educational administration. In turn, an accelerated interest in more sophisticated statistics and analytical methodologies developed, especially in major research universities. But a gulf was also created between university researchers and school practitioners, with the former dominating the professional ranks of degree programs. Goldhammer suggests that today a special effort is needed to bridge this gulf between "those who study" and "those who practice" to achieve a balance and foster communication. (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 25)

Goldhammer's approach to educational administrator preservice preparation is organized around six key elements designed to directly affect practice in the field. Rather than specify exact coursework, Goldhammer outlines what he considers to be the most salient issue areas as they have surfaced during his many years of work with practicing school administrators and his fellow university researchers. Summarized, these first three elements describe Goldhammer's theoretical rationale and represent his view of what should constitute the essential formal _core_ experience:

Core Element 1

The substance of preservice programs needs to be developed on a sound _scientific_ _basis_. His caveat here is that students who are preparing to be school administrators must be well grounded in a tested scientific knowledge base as "_users_ _and_ _implementors_--as designers and engineers--rather than as researchers and theoreticians _per_ _se_." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 25)

Goldhammer illustrates this point by noting that he recently reviewed all of the legal cases included in Volume I of

West's new publication, The Education Law Reporter, and a large percentage of them resulted from administrators' failure to know the relevant law or to practice sound management based upon the knowledge readily available in field.

> Educational Law Reporter is filled with cases where the courts have had to remind educators of the basic principles of sound administration and recite to them what are their professional responsibilities in matters of personnel, supervision, student conduct, and safety precautions. The administrators who didn't know, who caused hardships on employees and students, who cost their districts countless dollars and precious loss of time, were students at some time in our classes, and we certificated their right to practice--even though they obviously didn't know!
> (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 26)

Core Element 2

The applicative aspects of scientific knowledge, research, and theory must be emphasized. Goldhammer stresses that the people degree programs certify to manage our nation's schools must know how to apply, use, and test new ideas and information in the pursuance of their leadership responsibilities. Passing courses and demonstrating textbook knowledge is not enough, according to Goldhammer. (Goldhammer, 1982)

Core Element 3

An educational training program for administrators should include several supervised clinical experiences in conjunction with formal "synthesizing" opportunities. Goldhammer recognizes that internships and field experiences were emphasized more heavily in the past, but due to the predominantly part-time, fully employed student population today, there is little opportunity for a program of studies to include anything but the taking of courses. From past experiences, educators have learned, however,

> that students benefited by systematic observation and participation in several field settings rather than just one internship period. We learned that students needed "synthesizing" opportunities to draw together their experiences, to compare them with the knowledge base, to analyze the nature of the situation and develop the plans and strategies indicated by their knowledge and likely to be relevant to the situation.
> (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7)

Goldhammer reinforces the conviction of many of his colleagues nationally (Hoyle, 1983; Silver, 1983; Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1981) that "a great need of the educational leader today is to be trained as a clinician." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7) The essence of this position is that all professional fields must address the fact that abstract knowledge is not the same as working guides for practice. The test of practice and experience is how well a practicing administrator can apply the correct knowledge to the right situations. Once again, this skill is the focus of practitioners when asked for their recommendations concerning relevant and useful preservice and inservice learning activities. They desire help in how to become better clinical practitioners of educational administration--how to better identify problems (perhaps earlier), diagnose specific weaknesses, prescribe better remedies with confidence, and evaluate for the achievement of desired outcomes. (Silver, 1983; Goldhammer, 1982; Pitner, 1981)

Elements 4 and 5 in Goldhammer's approach to preparation of educational leaders address the specific content development of the additional skills and abilities an administrator should possess and form the central theme around which more specialized training can be planned. At this juncture, after the core of administrative "learnings" (McCleary, 1982) has been completed, Goldhammer (1982) believes the novice administrator should have the opportunity to fine-tune his teaching and human relations skills, as well as develop and expand his overall educational philosophies within the context of contemporary society and the school setting in which he plans to serve.

Content Element 4

> An educational administrator ought to be a "specialist in teaching and learning" and be able to identify those factors which foster effectiveness in these central areas. Truly capable administrators know how to structure relationships and make decisions which aid the educational functions of a school.
> (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7)

Professional arguments surrounding this "master teacher" concept accumulate around the two positions related in the earlier discussion of administrator role responsibilities, both perceived and actual. There are those who believe the administrator has little time and/or knowledge to be an effective instructional leader and must, therefore, serve in a primarily facilitative role. Others maintain that active leadership and involvement in curriculum development and delivery in partnership with teachers is an administrator's cornerstone responsibility. As in most debates of this nature, these issues are difficult to defend from an "either/or" point-of-view. The general consensus seems to be that school climate considerations need to be approached in tandem with curriculum and instruction.

Study groups across the State of California have generally concurred with this dual view, as reported in The Principalship in California: Keeper of the Dream, (Olivero, 1980):

> The instructional leader must pay attention to the "affect" in any classroom the same way (s)he pays attention to the instructional techniques. What is taught, how it is taught, and how students and teachers feel about instruction are all important areas for the leader to consider.
>
> (Olivero, 1980, p. 13)

Goldhammer's approach outlined in Content Element #4 (1982) seems to be in agreement with the Olivero assumption. He adds a cautionary emphasis for those who tend to apply a too strict management approach to educational leadership training at the expense of training in the application of sound educational principles. "Management is a tool," Goldhammer notes, "and we can have efficient managers at the expense of providing educational leadership in the executive direction of our schools." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7)

Content Element 5

"Educational leaders should know the realities of the society in which they have to provide direction to the education of all ages." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7)

Goldhammer's philosophy is in agreement with John Hoyle's (1981); both researchers view the good administrator as a futurist and a sound sociologist. The contemporary administrator, Goldhammer states, must be "more than a housekeeper of the school" and be able to answer real questions such as "Where are we going? What's happening to children and adults in the communities in which they live? What are the portents for them for the future?" (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7)

Content Element 6

Goldhammer argues that the profession as a whole must study the ethical principles of administration and the personal value systems of present and future administrators.

Goldhammer cites Count's work which found that administrators take on the values of the dominant members of their boards. (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7) He (Goldhammer) is concerned about what he sees as a growing rift between administration and teaching, a "cleavage which administrators have helped to foster." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7) In professions other than educational administration (i.e., law and medicine), Goldhammer believes that there exist some principles of the ethics of practice around which much of the preparatory program evolves. But educational administrators are more inclined to define leadership in psychological or sociological terms and teach ethical principles of leadership behavior only within those contexts. Goldhammer expresses his concern that, in educational administration, "our research has eschewed studying the ethical issues related to the practice of administration." (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 7) Goldhammer concludes his remarks concerning content Element #6 with what he believes the central question in this aspect of leadership preparation should be--"Leadership for whom and for what?" (Goldhammer, 1982, p. 8) Thus, the Goldhammer perspective is that present and future administrators must help one another examine the assumptions, beliefs, values, aspirations, and concerns which undergird leadership roles.

Approach Two: John Hoyle
AASA Guidelines

Dr. John Hoyle, of Texas A&M University, served as the 1982 American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Co-operative Professor of the Year. In that role, he was asked to draft revised guidelines for the training and preparation of school administrators. AASA's working premise is that "School administrators occupy critical positions in our nation's schools," and, therefore, preparation guidelines which better reflect the contemporary demands of today's society are needed. (AASA Guidelines, 1982, p. 1) The Guidelines cite previous research on critical issues in education and identify six recurrent themes from both UCEA studies and the national literature in general. According to AASA, the critical themes with implications for present and future school leaders are: 1) changing demographics; 2) our unstable economic structure; 3) the need to adopt new technologies; 4) changing labor market structures; 5) preserving cultural diversity and human rights; and 6) changing family structures. (AASA Guidelines, 1982, pp. 1-5)

The AASA Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators were written to complement certification requirements in the various states, primarily because they apply to administration at all levels. The Guidelines' audience, as defined by John Hoyle and his AASA colleagues, is as follows:

> This important publication provides insight for those people who aspire to a career in school administration, those who are already in the field and want to remain current, those who provide preparation programs and state officials who play key roles in recommending or establishing certification requirements. Guidelines . . . also gives direction for inservice training.
>
> (AASA Guidelines, 1982, p. 1)

John Hoyle agrees with many of his colleagues (Cawelti, 1982; Pitner, 1982; March, 1974) that

> the search for the best way to prepare educational administrators is endless. We who profess educational administration have little conclusive evidence about the relationship among administrator preparation, work, and effectiveness. (Hoyle, 1983, p. 1)

Until the development of the AASA Guidelines, no professional administrator association had systematically considered what the total program for the preparation of effective contemporary school administrators should be. This has been due in part to the difficulty of collecting useful information about what impact administrators actually have on the people and outcomes in their schools. (Hoyle, 1983) In practice, professors of educational administration, according to Hoyle,

> . . . make overtures to effective program training sequences in master's, intermediate, and doctoral programs but generally advise students into fragmented individual courses with extreme content overlap or those loosely coupled with one another.
>
> (Hoyle, 1983, p. 2)

Thus, the primary goal of the AASA effort was to respond to this programmatic dilemma and develop an aid to planning. As noted earlier, John Hoyle, the author of the Guidelines, states that they "are written to apply to all administrator programs regardless of size, types of degrees or programs offered." (Hoyle, 1983, p. 7) Hoyle acknowledges that while the various administrative functions (such as central office, principal, or assistant principal) require some discrete skills different from one another, a common set of administrative competencies and skills are universal. He adds, "These competencies and skills must be delivered in a system with logical sequencing of classwork and field experience." (Hoyle, 1983, p. 7)

The 1982 AASA Guidelines have been presented to the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the AASA official position on administrator preparation. Whether or not they are officially adopted by NCATE, (NCATE is scheduled to consider formal adoption of the AASA Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators (1982) in September of 1984), AASA is confident that "program planning guided by the AASA guidelines will have little difficulty meeting the standards of NCATE or any other accreditating agency." (Hoyle, 1983, p. 8)

Educators in the State of Texas have recently used the AASA Guidelines as a baseline set of criteria for discussion in their assessment and reformulation of three administrator certification and preparation programs (mid-management, instructional supervisor, and superintendent) in Texas.

Three professional groups, the Texas Professors of Educational Administration (TPEA), the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession, and the Texas School Administrators Council (TSAC), have been engaged in the review and improvement of preparation standards for instructional supervisors, including vocational supervisors, principals, and superintendents. Last summer (July 12-14, 1983), these educators combined their efforts during a three-day workshop held at the University of Houston, where they formed a work group for each certification level and accomplished the following two major objectives:

> 1. To describe what the practitioner should know to perform the duties of the professional certificate.
> 2. To describe what the practitioner should be able to do to carry out the role expectations of the professional certificate.
>
> (TPEA position paper, February 15, 1984, pp. 1-2)

The Texas work groups found that their separate conclusions and recommendations contained many common elements; they also found similar substantive overlap in their reviews of current literature produced by national study groups, other state certification panels (i.e., the Florida Council on Educational Management), and the work of individual researcher/practitioners nationwide. What follows is a summary of the recommendations which evolved from these cooperative deliberations, compiled by the Texas Professors of Educational Administration's (TPEA) Administrator Standards Committee (advisory to the TEA's Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession's Committee on Certification Programs and Requirements). Also included are some of John Hoyle's explanatory notes and rationale pertaining to the development of the AASA Guidelines for the Preparation of Schools Administrators, which were used as discussion and working guides for the statewide proposals addressing professional certification in Texas. A more detailed version of the Texas recommendations and a copy of the 1982 AASA *Guidelines* are included in the Appendix.

The 1982 AASA *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators* is organized into three major sections. The first section includes seven (7) leadership outcome goals; section two contains seven (7) competencies and related skills to help accomplish the leadership outcome goals; and section three includes the five (5) management systems components, seven content components, clinical components, and the professionalism and renewal components. (Hoyle, 1983) The TPEA Administrator Standards Committee was influenced by the 1982 AASA *Guidelines*, agreed with the *seven leadership outcome goals* as the basis of a core curriculum for all levels of certification, and added more detailed definitions to correspond with Texas educational issues and leadership needs.

Summarized, the following preservice program components were outlined by the Texas study group:

> *Common Core* (15-18 hours)
> The TPEA concurs with AASA (with some clarification added) that graduates from certification programs for instructional supervisor, mid-management, and superintendent must *understand the theoretical foundations* and *demonstrate the application* of each of the following performance goals.
> (TPEA position paper, February 15, 1984, p. 3)

Texas educators believe that these seven outcome goals can be reached in the 15-18 hour common administrative core.

Programmatically, the TPEA suggests that

> units within courses or new courses can be initiated to assure that the goals are being addressed and reached. Regardless of the course content, structure,

> or delivery procedure, each institution offering programs leading to administrative or supervisory certification will need to certify that the seven Leadership Outcome Goals are being addressed. Competency tests developed by the professor and/or department may measure goal accomplishment.
> (TPEA position paper, February, 1984, p. 4)

According to TPEA (and the AASA Guidelines), Texas school leaders of tomorrow must demonstrate the following AASA competencies:

School Climate Improvement Program

1. Establish and maintain a positive and open learning environment to bring about the motivation and social integration of community, students, and staff (i.e., interpersonal and multicultural components).

Political Theory and Skills

2. Build strong local, state, and national support for education (i.e., political, communication, and coalition building components).

Systematic School Curriculum

3. Develop and deliver an effective curriculum which expands the definitions of literacy, competency, and cultural integration to include advanced technologies, problem solving, critical thinking and communication skills, and cultural enrichment for all students (i.e., special, futures, reading, gifted, career, vocational-technical components).

Instructional Management System

4. Develop and implement effective models/modes of instructional delivery that make the best use of time, staff, advanced technologies, community resources, and financial means to maximize student outcomes (i.e., time-on-task, mastery/outcome based programs, differentiated staffing).

Staff Development and Evaluation Systems

5. Create programs of continuous improvement, including evaluation of both staff and program effectiveness as keys to student learning and development (i.e., effective schools research, clinical supervision components).

Allocating Resources

6. Skillfully manage school system operations and facilities to enhance student learning (i.e., legal and local, state, and national policy and regulations components).

Using Research

7. Conduct and make use of significant research as a basis for problem solving and program planning of all kinds (i.e., needs assessment and cooperative goal setting components).

(TPEA position paper, 1984, pp. 3-4; AASA Guidelines, 1982, pp. 7-10)

The TPEA's parenthetical additions contained in the above list condense the detailed "Competencies and Skills" section of the AASA Guidelines. The Guidelines state that "all students completing preparation programs should be able to demonstrate competencies related to each of the seven (Leadership Outcome) goals." (AASA Guidelines, 1982, p. 7) (The Guidelines list specific "underlying skills and understandings" under each competency; the comprehensive list is found in the "Competencies and Skills" section of the Guidelines, included in the Appendix of this review.)

Program Delivery Components

Program delivery components "should reflect contemporary management concepts and technologies" according to AASA. (AASA Guidelines, 1982, p. 11) The following capabilities should be present in such a contemporary approach to program: 1) diagnosis (as determined by faculty, to assess students' minimum mastery levels for admission, counseling, placement, and degree completion, including the Leadership Outcome Goals); 2) design (reality oriented instructional situations are encouraged, based upon diagnosis of individual student strengths and weaknesses); 3) instructional (quality full-time teaching, including practicing administrators as adjunct faculty to promote theory/practice union); 4) resource (use of other disciplines); and 5) program evaluation (continuous monitoring of all aspects of the program, including systematically derived performance information on both current students and alumni). (AASA _Guidelines_, 1982, pp. 11-12)

Texas educators, within their recommendations for formal Professional Certificate programs, agreed with the AASA _Guidelines_ recommendations on the specifics (listed above) as program delivery components. (TPEA position paper, 1984, pp. 8-9)

A Common Core

The AASA _Guidelines_ recognize that degree programs need to be individualized according to the career goals and results of a student's competency diagnosis. Therefore, "contemporary programs should contain several content concentrations from which individual programs can be constructed." (AASA _Guidelines_, 1982, p. 12) The following is a list of an expected _common core of requirements_ as recommended by AASA to be included in all degree programs, whatever the administrative specialization:

1. Administrative, organizational, political, and learning theory;
2. Technical areas of administrative practice;
3. Behavioral and social sciences;
4. Foundations of education;
5. Research;
6. Advanced technologies; [and]
7. Ethical principles of the profession.

(AASA _Guidelines_, 1982, pp. 12-13)

Clinical Components

The Texas educators agreed with AASA on the importance of field based clinical experiences; the Texas recommendation is that internships of 3-6 semester hours be required for instructional supervisor, mid-management, and superintendent certification. Monitoring and quality control should be the primary responsibility of the university with support from the cooperating school districts. The TPEA also recommends and supports the Texas Association of School Administrators legislative package for paid internships. (TPEA position paper, 1984, p. 4)

The AASA _Guidelines_ specify that _several_ field settings should be utilized as part of administrator preservice preparation. The purposes, specified by AASA, are

> to provide opportunities for students to compare their experiences with the knowledge base, to diagnose sources of difficulties and identify problems, to develop plans and strategies suggested by their knowledge, and to assess outcomes.
> (AASA _Guidelines_, 1982, p. 13)

Specialized Preparation Beyond the Core

Texas educators recommend the following additional preparation beyond the 15-18 hour common core program, designed to "assure accomplishment of the Leadership Outcome Goals common to the three administrative groups" addressed at the statewide workshop. (TPEA position paper, 1984, p. 4)

Mid-Management (The Principal)

An additional 15-18 hours in administration of special education, reading, career education and/or vocational-technical education, organizational theory, instructional management and curriculum, and computers for instructional and administrative use are recommended by the TPEA.

Texas educators also recommend the following courses or projects to develop competency:

a. Administration of Elementary Schools or Administration of Middle, Junior High, and High Schools
b. Administration of Programs for Diverse Populations in Cross Cultural Environments including Bilingual Education programs
c. Administration of Special and Support Services
d. Community Education
e. Educational Planning and Futurism
f. Instructional Management (the role of the principal in effective schools)
g. Curriculum Development (i.e., theory and H.B. 246 implications)
h. Computers for Administration and Instruction
i. Program Evaluation and Accreditation

(TPEA position paper, 1984, pp. 5-6)

Superintendent

Texas educators recommend that programs for the superintendent should build on the 45 hours of mid-management requirements with 15 additional hours, including courses about the role of the superintendent, administrative and organization theory and behavior, school facilities, business accounting and management principles, the law and politics of education, and administration of special programs.

Texas educators recommend the following courses or projects to develop competency for the superintendent.

a. The School Superintendency and School Board Relations
b. The Politics of Education
c. School Law and Policy
d. Organizational Theory and Administrative Behavior
e. Program Evaluation and Accreditation
f. Educational Planning/Futurism
g. Administration of Supervisory Personnel

h. Instructional Management (implications for H.B. 246)
i. Business Management and Accounting
j. Administrative Applications of the Computer
(TPEA position paper, 1984, pp. 6-7)

Recommendations for Courses in Disciplines Outside Education

The TPEA recommendations support the established requirement in Texas for nine to twelve (9-12) semester hours of coursework in other disciplines, such as sociology, anthropology, psychology, etc. However, TPEA cautions that such outside coursework should be relevant to the Leadership Outcome Goals, and perhaps some of the "newer courses in computer applications and other new technologies, multicultural education, mastery learning, and future studies," which are frequently offered only in schools or colleges of education, "would be more relevant and useful to contemporary school administrators." They opt for "flexibility to require courses or projects most relevant to effective school research and practice and facilitate Leadership Outcome Goals." (TPEA position paper, 1984, p. 7)

Recommendations for Certificate Programs

Texas educators recommend 45 semester hours of graduate credit for the Professional Certificate for Mid-Management Administrators (all positions other than the superintendency) and at least 60 semester hours of graduate credit for the Professional Certificate for School Superintendents. TPEA specifies the following common core:

Common Core for Mid-Management Administrator, Instructional Supervisor, and Superintendent

Fifteen to eighteen (15-18) semester hours of graduate credit in courses open only to graduate students designed to develop general administrative and supervisory competencies and understandings in administrative and organizational theory and practice, curriculum theory and instructional supervision, school law and business management, and the administration of special and compensatory education and other components to assure mastery of Leadership Outcome Goals presented earlier.

(TPEA position paper, 1984, p. 8)

Approach Three: Lloyd McCleary
Field-Based Preparation

Lloyd McCleary is Professor of Educational Administration and Director of Research and Development at The University of Utah-Salt Lake City. Dr. McCleary directed the National High School Principal Study sponsored by NASSP and completed in 1979 and a follow-up study on the principalship sponsored by the Rockefeller Family Fund. He has authored texts on both elementary and secondary school administration as well as numerous articles and monographs on school-based management and leadership. Dr. McCleary has also directed projects in education for the U.S. Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the World Bank, and currently, the Department of Defense Dependent Schools. He is director of a long-term project to develop and field test individualized modules for administrator inservice education.

McCleary and his colleagues in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Utah/Salt Lake City believe that a professional degree program should include coursework and other experiences which develop both theoretical understandings and the clinical skills of practice. The quality and diversity of the students, their "expedient progress through a planned program of study" and their "active involvement with faculty in scholarly activities" are viewed as critical to a quality program. (McCleary, 1984, p. 2) The University of Utah's program in administration is highly individualized; adaptations are made in program content and experiences to correspond with assessed student potential and the needs and opportunities of the educational field in which the student is interested. Because active study and involvement in the problems of the field in close cooperation with professors is "of primary importance," clinical and field based experiences are required, including the standard internship for those seeking line positions in public schools and state agencies. (McCleary, 1984, p. 3)

Although the Utah program places a strong emphasis upon field based experiences and active practitioner involvement in instruction and supervision of graduate students, the Department recognizes that many questions and concerns about the nature and quality of those experiences remain. These questions and possible solutions are addressed through ongoing involvement of the entire Department in the NASSP/University Consortium (a detailed description of the NASSP Assessment Centers and companion projects is included in the Appendix). Through the NASSP/University Consortium, Department faculty members are working in conjunction with a group of practitioners from eight adjacent school districts; together they are currently examining a variety of options for providing suitable field experiences, both preservice and inservice. According to Professor McCleary, the "provision and programming of experiences, evaluation of student performance, shared responsibilities for supervision and many other concerns occupy this group." (McCleary, 1984, p. 3)

During the past few decades, Professor McCleary has participated in research concerning the most effective ways to prepare school administrators; he has become acutely aware of the confluence of issues and teaching and learning approaches which have been advocated and tried throughout this period. McCleary's familiarity with the field has resulted in an appraisal of the current status of the field which takes into account institutional and societal realities affecting contemporary school administration preparation programs and practice.

> The nature of the preparation of school administrators has been the subject of constant examination and critical review since the immediate post-World War II period. Efforts to define the content domains of the field, to identify viable preparation program designs and to develop instructional materials and delivery systems have failed to produce a dominant model. Preparation programs have been enriched but not unified; issues have been analyzed but not resolved; emphases and directions have been identified but none has won general approval as the route to follow . . . The result is competing conceptions of emphases, content, methods, and program designs. Specific programs are ultimately determined more by the realities of institutional constraints and the interests of those who staff programs at each institution than by evidence and rational analysis. (McCleary, 1984, p. 1)

McCleary shares the views of his colleagues in the Department of Educational Administration that university preparation must be actively connected to the educational constituency it serves. Through his experience, however, he maintains that "cautious assessment (of the efficacy of field based preparation) is more appropriate than expansive advocacy." (McCleary, 1984, p. 1) In a paper entitled "Field Based Preparation: Toward a Defensible Preparation Program," McCleary presents

1) a review of preparation issues and thought as they relate to field based training and 2) an analysis of various ways and means to improve the experience for students of educational administration.

McCleary notes that field based experiences have always been considered to be an important element of preparation, and until the late 1940s, such experiences were "highly prescriptive accounts of practice with content based upon descriptions of 'current best practice.'" (McCleary, 1984, p. 2) Graduate students visited schools, listened to guest lectures by practicing administrators on subjects such as scheduling, school administration procedures, and the preparation of model budgets. In larger school districts, McCleary notes, "Junior executive" programs were employed in which "course work for certification was provided by the university while the school district provided their people with their version of how to administer a school." (McCleary, 1984, p. 2)

Since then, various national associations were formed with the purpose of building a scholarly foundation to the field of educational administration. New professional organizations such as the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) combined their efforts with those of the ongoing National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and began exploring the practical linkages between practicing school administration and college and university preparation for school leadership positions. In 1960, NASSP began a major effort to install the internship as a regular element of preparation programs and highlighted the conditions necessary if the field were to be effectively used as a resource in preparation programs. (McCleary, 1984, p. 3)

McCleary outlines some of the problems and constraints inherent in field based programs, issues which he and his colleagues in the NASSP/University Consortium are working with in Salt Lake City. He groups these issues, or variables, into three areas: 1) quality of inputs (i.e., the intern and the practitioner); 2) feedback processes between school setting and the university; and 3) the relationship of the university to the larger environment. (McCleary, 1984, p. 6)

The first variable includes the "quality of the potential administrator in training, the practitioner as trainer and the facilities and materials available in the field." (McCleary, 1984, p. 6) In an earlier article (McCleary, 1978) reported his findings concerning practitioner/intern relationships. McCleary found that when the trainee identified too strongly with the school district in terms of allegiance, motivation, and orientation to district values, dispassionate professional study was not possible. In the same respect, McCleary found that the practitioner serving as a role model/trainer often has difficulty finding the time and energy necessary to devote to an intern. (McCleary, 1984, p. 6) Situational specificity also can be a concern in an internship experience; the practitioner may present a narrow perspective of administration which relates more to the particular district's immediate needs than to a wider variety of situations and problems. (McCleary, 1984, p. 6)

The Utah program is using the NASSP Assessment Center to help address the qualitative issues in Variable #1, "the quality of inputs." (p. 81, this review) Using the Assessment Center screening instruments and activities, both promising potential administrators and exceptionally competent practitioners are identified. Selected trainees and qualified administrators are, in turn, "licensed" as assessors and become a prime source for determining the quality of other trainees and help derive an objective assessment of trainee needs. According to McCleary:

> . . . the practitioner who is also a qualified assessor, when fully supported by the district, has a different orientation to training and a commitment not easily obtained in a professor-administrator negotiation over the provision of training experiences.
> (McCleary, 1984, p. 6)

Problems surrounding the sharing of information, arriving at decisions and coordinating efforts in field experiences are identified by McCleary as Variable #2. Individual personality and philosophical perspectives enter into consideration here, and McCleary finds that bridging traditional patterns of interactions between colleges, universities, and school districts requires careful planning, including attempts to anticipate possible communication problems. McCleary suggests that sharing the planning process through a Consortium of Institutions can be useful in facilitating a free-flowing working relationship.

The third variable identified by McCleary involves the university's accountability to the outside world, as the "primary University role in field based training is that of legitimating the preparation of administrators." (McCleary, 1984, p. 7) Critical to this function is the measurement of competence, and at the University of Utah, the Assessment Center provides assistance in assessment, at all points of a student's progression through a degree program. McCleary states that "all of the questions pertinent to performance evaluation occur at this stage. What objectives? What levels of attainment? What instruments and procedures for measurement attainment? What criteria to judge attainment? Who judges?" (McCleary, 1984, p. 8) After evaluation procedures are specified and the range of evaluation questions dealt with, McCleary cautions that both practitioners and professors may need to recognize that some outcomes may not be measureable, and care should be taken not to over-emphasize evaluation to the detriment of instruction. (McCleary, 1984, p. 11)

McCleary acknowledges that the programming of field based training to assure that "experiences contribute to learner needs in an efficient manner" is a challenge. He cautions against conceiving the experience alone to be the content. "Rather," McCleary states, "the experience should serve as the application or illustration of the content." (McCleary, 1984, p. 9)

Although the programming, evaluation, and follow-through necessary for meaningful field based administrative experiences require much more careful thinking and cooperation than traditional classroom teaching, McCleary and his colleagues at the University of Utah share their advocacy of practical application of theory and skills with other colleagues nationally, at colleges and universities such as Columbia Teachers College, Texas at Austin, Texas A&M, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Harvard, and New York University, to name a few considered in this review. McCleary offers this additional observation in support of field based experience:

> . . . professions (medicine, engineering, management, education) hold that preparation is a responsibility of the entire profession, a progression from the study of basic, supporting disciplines to field based practice. (McCleary, 1984, p. 12)

In summary, McCleary points out that a discipline needs the field as a basis of inquiry, and field based research procedures could be used to validate and refine findings such as those mentioned in the beginning of this review--current studies which center around issues of quality education, administrator effectiveness, and school climate. Data which would contribute to a professional knowledge base upon which larger studies could be constructed would be an important secondary outgrowth of an intern's integrative experience in the study of school administration. (McCleary, 1984, p. 13)

Approach Four: Paula Silver
A Professional Practice Orientation

Paula Silver is Associate Professor of Educational Administration, College of Education, at the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign. Dr. Silver has published extensively on the topic of professionalism in educational administration. Her orientation toward the education and training of school administrators is similar to Goldhammer's, John Hoyle's (AASA Guidelines, 1982), and other researcher/practitioners (Boyan, 1980; Erickson, 1979). These researchers believe that it can be helpful to conceptualize the field of educational administration in terms that are less congruent with an academic discipline and more like the prestigious applied professions such as law and medicine. Although some practitioners of educational administration would argue that their field is already a fully developed profession, Silver cites some possible disagreement as expressed by professionals in other fields:

> They [practitioners who believe that educational administration is a fully developed profession] would point to their license to practice, national associations, scholarly and practical periodicals, and extensive training to support this claim. People in other fields of practice, however, might disagree. These people could well point to the lack of a national licensing examination, the absence of peer review for maintaining standards of practice, and the lack of an explicit code of ethics to support the position that educational administration is not, after all, a full-fledged profession. (Silver, 1983, pp. 41-42.)

Silver's thesis is that the field of school administration needs to develop a sound professional knowledge base through the experientially-tested contributions of practitioners and researchers. In addition, the field must maintain a professional service commitment with a continuous focus on student learning outcomes. (Silver, 1983)

Goldhammer (1982), reviewed earlier, noted the 1950s movement in the field of educational administration from the highly prescriptive and experience-based approaches to the use of theories and survey findings drawn from behavioral science disciplines. These more scientific approaches became the bases for research about educational organizations and their administrators. Silver (1983) notes that when researchers approached educational administration as a discipline, they were also inclined to focus attention on the administrators themselves--their characteristics, behavior, and organizational contexts

> as if administrators and administration were the phenomena to be understood (described, explained, or predicted). Scant attention was directed towards how administrators can enhance the outcomes of their schools [or districts] or towards what administrators can do to reduce the inequities of schooling.
> (Silver, 1983, p. 10)

The essence of Silver's theoretical distinction between professions and academic disciplines is that disciplines seek better understanding of phenomena (such as organisms, matter, past events, ideas) while the service professions seek solutions to human problems (such as physical malfunctions, injustices, tooth decay, and inadequate machines). (Silver, 1983, p. 42) The type and substance of record keeping is also important to Silver's approach to the generation of a professional knowledge base. "A key distinction in practice is that academicians maintain records of research procedures whereas professional practitioners maintain a record of each individual case, its treatment, and results." (Silver, 1983, p. 42)

Silver has developed the following table which serves to illustrate her view of how the field of educational administration might function as a profession rather than as an academic discipline.

TABLE 1

ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES IN COMPARISON TO APPLIED PROFESSIONS

Characteristic	Academic Disciplines	Applied Professions
Focus of attention	a class of phenomena	a class of human problems
Purpose of field	understand nature	solve client's problem
Problem recognition	observed anamoly	expressed human need
Procedures	generate theories; deduce hypotheses; test hypotheses through observations	borrow theories deduce techniques test techniques experimentally
Criteria of success	increased understanding of nature	better solutions to human problems
Written products	theories; research reports	record of each case; research reports

(cont'd)

TABLE 1
(cont'd)

Professionalized School Administration

Characteristic	Applied Professions	School Administration
Focus of attention	a class of human problems	inadequate student learning (cognitive, affective, or psychomotor)
Purpose of field	solve client's problem	improve student learning
Problem recognition	expressed human need	outcome data below par or inequitable
Procedures	borrow theories; deduce techniques; test techniques experimentally	draw upon social sciences; deduce techniques; test techniques experimentally
Criteria of success	better solutions to human problems	increased and more equitable student outcomes
Written products	record of each case; research reports	record of each problem, treatment, apparent result; research reports

(Silver, 1983, p. 44)

Silver's applied profession approach regards the entire school as the instrument of education and then specifies a reasonable set of student outcome goals. Whenever these goals are inadequately or inequitably attained, the principal and/or the superintendent would proceed with problem-solving by:

1. Drawing upon his knowledge of education in general (including theory), the individual school, and social science to identify a likely cause and possible solution (strategy);
2. Collecting and recording pertinent data;
3. Recording solution tried; and
4. Recording apparent results at a later date, when assessing the situation as a whole.

(Summarized from Silver, 1983, p. 42)

The records of practitioners, according to Silver, could later be consulted and studied by researchers for use in similar problem situations, or to "codify knowledge," i.e., to build a tested and applied body of knowledge for use in continuous training in the field.

Silver is cognizant of the necessary personal qualities both practicing administrators and those aspiring to school leadership positions would need to develop and maintain--especially in the areas of attitudes, aspirations, and personal accountability. Summarized, the special leadership qualities necessary for this pro-active, problem-solving approach to school administration as viewed by Silver are: a love of challenge; optimistic risk-taking; personal integrity and responsibility for all outcomes; the ability to delegate wisely; and an open, inquiring mind.

> Principals and superintendents would need to view their own actions as experiments in the improvement of student outcomes and would have to abandon defensiveness and self-justification in favor of a spirit of objectivity. (Silver, 1983, p. 43)

In addition to the personal character traits Silver lists above, she believes that a professional administrator training and education program would need to provide developmental situations which would foster skills and abilities such as:

1. creativity and interpersonal skill;
2. ability to adapt to environmental and technological changes;
3. formal assessment skills combined with sound professional judgment;
4. technical accounting skills for keeping clear written records; compilation of research and outcome data;
5. autonomy, i.e., ". . . independence of action and discretion . . ." (Silver, 1983, p. 43) (NOTE: This is not so much a skill as a freedom, and one that is not entirely within the principal's or superintendent's control--a common constraint listed by both the Georgia administrators sampled and the national samples which surfaced in this review); and
6. continuous intellectual growth, both through experiential reflection, sharing with colleagues, and familiarity with recent research, to add to the development of a sound, useful body of "expert knowledge of how to enhance student outcomes." (Silver, 1983, p. 45)

(Summarized from Silver, 1983, pp. 43-45)

The Apex Center

Dr. Silver has incorporated her ideas on professional development for school administrators into a new approach aimed at the production and collection of practical, applicable information for improving administrative performance through cooperation on an international scale. The APEX Center--"Center for Advancing Principal Excellence"--is located at Silver's home campus, the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign and is co-sponsored with the University Council for Educational Administration. Silver and her colleague, Dr. Thomas Sergiovanni, of Trinity University (the former Chair of Administration and Supervision at the University of Illinois and present Editor of the Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), are President and Vice President, respectively. The APEX Center has an advisory panel of over a dozen practicing administrators and researcher/practitioners from across the nation and Canada as well as Japan, Australia, and the Netherlands. School districts throughout these countries are invited to participate in the activities of the Apex Center beginning this September, 1984.

APEX participating principals will be asked to maintain written case records of two (or more) administrative problems each year, and share these copies (confidentiality protected) with the APEX Center. In return, they will receive "concise monthly reports on matters pertinent to the improvement of administrative practice and the advancement of educational excellence." (University of Illinois, APEX Center special preview announcement, Spring, 1984) The theory behind this data-gathering approach is modeled after professional development strategies in the service professions such as law, medicine, and engineering. In these professions, the practitioners have access to a knowledge base composed of the collected case-study experiences of their colleagues who are similarly situated. This knowledge base includes both effective and ineffective solutions attempted and the practitioners' intuitive and experiential knowledge gained and updated along the way. Additional benefits gained from the process of reflective note-taking while working with the more "perplexing puzzles," according to the APEX Center's philosophy, would be the enhancement of the administrator's personal understanding of the problem, an aid to recollection of past details, and a built-in check for his assumptions about future events.

Another objective of the APEX Center is associated with recent effective schools research. According to the Center, "Participating principals will be helped in assessing a range of student outcomes and in identifying alterable school characteristics related to inadequate student outcomes." (APEX Center program announcement, Spring, 1984) To this end, the APEX Center will generate and share with participants information (confidentiality protected) regarding the following: a schools' student outcomes relative to the averages for all participating schools; particular school characteristics which correspond to various student outcomes; and administrative strategies which participants found successful in "altering targeted school characteristics." (APEX Center announcement, Spring, 1984)

A more detailed description of the services and functions of the new APEX Center is included in the Appendix. Both the staff and the sponsors of the Center believe that it will be "a unique professional development opportunity for school systems, one which promises a new and highly practical body of knowledge for participants and the field of educational administration at large." (APEX Center announcement, Spring, 1984)

Educational Administration Programs in Georgia and a National Selection of Companion Programs

Parameters of this Study

In response to the foregoing comments and expressed needs of both Georgia school administrators and those of their colleagues throughout the nation, it was timely to review and summarize the admission and academic program requirements found in 1) graduate programs in Educational Administration in the University System of Georgia and private universities within Georgia, and 2) a selection of companion programs nationally. Whenever a constituency speaks of "what should be," it can be helpful to respond after identifying "what is"; this objective formed the basis of the collection and review of this information.

The parameters of this study were modest--to discover and report the basic framework of the preservice preparation process for school administrators and, along the way, attempt to identify some exemplary developments both within the State of Georgia and without. This review of preparation programs was not designed to generate complete and definitive descriptions of what today's programs are or predictions of what tomorrow's programs will or should be. The intent was to produce information on some perceived trends and needs in the preparation of school administrators.

This review employed basic applied research methods and was primarily confined to careful analysis of official graduate catalog data. Additional published graduate program descriptions and degree requirements compiled by the individual Departments of Administration and Supervision at each institution were consulted for supplementary detail when necessary. Telephone requests for clarification and elaboration were employed as well. In nearly all cases, in both the State of Georgia programs and those out-of-state, the descriptive data were received in many different formats and were dispersed throughout graduate school information. It was necessary to establish a data collection framework which would allow for relatively easy summary and review of the various programmatic approaches to the education and practical training of potential school administrators. The table format which follows was evolutionary in organization and represents the basic program characteristics of a majority of the administration and supervision programs. Exceptions to this traditional structure are noted.

As noted previously, this review was primarily limited to an examination of current printed descriptive information (catalogues and graduate student degree information). Although accuracy of the data was corroborated by the educational administration departments during and after the data compilation, the lack of comparable data collected over time makes it necessary to consider these data as a snapshot of the "state-of-the-art" in educational administration preparation. The research reviewed in this study indicates that academic preparation programs by nature should be flexible, i.e. responsive to true student needs, contemporary and future-oriented in both theory and practical preparation, yet balanced in their response to public pressures and trends in education. Preparation programs should also be creative in working with a variety of individual student potentials and career goals. The very purpose of description of "what-is" is to provide the necessary background so that appropriate questions can be asked.

Faculty and student interviews were not a part of this survey of educational administration programs; therefore, a "weighting" of the program content balance from the perspectives of all people involved in its delivery and through student participation is not contained here. Careful examination of required versus elective coursework in the Georgia programs provides a two-pronged picture which reflects: a) State of Georgia Department of Education course requirements for certification in Administration and Supervision Level 5 (AS-5) and Administration and Supervision Level 6 (AS-6), and b) individual departmental philosophies concerning the theoretical and applied content areas a prospective administrator needs to master to function equally well in all school leadership areas.

The national sample of preservice program characteristics contained in this review essentially reflects the same picture as the Georgia programs regarding a) state certification requirements and b) the program objectives of individual departments and their faculty. Generally, state certification requirements for certain coursework and professional practice applications form a subset of a total preservice program in school administration. However, some of the programs reviewed in this national sample represent a significant departure from this traditional program structure, and state certification requirements are either subsumed or less clearly present in some of the reorganized programs. (NOTE: These less traditional programs have, in some cases, made it necessary for the individual graduate students to bear the primary responsibility for ensuring that their professional academic preparation will also satisfy state certification requirements.)

Examples of less traditional programs are found at the Universities of Utah at Salt Lake City, Texas at Austin, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Columbia Teachers College, and Harvard, which have integrated practical applications and active practitioner involvement in instruction and training throughout many aspects of their degree programs. In these programs, traditional subject matter has been adapted to the contemporary educational needs of the various school settings in which their graduates intend to practice school administration. These programs also make use of formal assessment procedures at regular intervals throughout the students' progression in the program. This measurement of students' acquired leadership competencies and areas of weakness created a need for more individualization and flexibility in programming than a traditional program structure allowed.

For comparative purposes, the table format used in this review is an attempt to tabulate the many and various program characteristics of both in-state (Georgia) and a sample of out-of-state degree programs in educational administration. This tabulation format proved somewhat limited, however, when the out-of-state nontraditional program structures and content were reviewed, and, therefore, variations and exceptions are noted whenever possible.

Master's level preparation programs which allow few elective freedoms and prescribe course requirements beyond the psychological-sociological foundations sequence provide the clearest picture of departmental philosophy and program objectives and goals. These programs specify which human relations, technical, and conceptual skills will be stressed within an "educational leadership" and administrative theory program structure. (NOTE: All eleven Georgia institutions were forwarded copies for verification.)

Georgia Educational Administration Programs: Some Observations

- NCATE Accreditation: Of the Georgia graduate preparation programs which also fulfill certification requirements at the building principal and superintendent levels, those which presently are not listed as NCATE accredited are relatively new (within the last three years: Albany State College, Effective Date: Fall, 1980; Augusta College, Effective Date: Fall, 1980; Columbus College, Effective Date: Summer, 1982; and Georgia College, Effective Date: Summer, 1982). Generally, it is considered standard and prudent practice to maintain and revise program criteria and instructional delivery through a program's formative years and invite an NCATE visit at a later date. Emory University's coursework in Administration and Supervision allows the individual to pursue AS-5 and AS-6 certification after M.Ed. completion. (Emory is presently engaged in a programmatic self-study. Several years ago, Emory decided not to participate in the NCATE accreditation process.

- Degrees Offered: The Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree is the most common Master's level degree offered in Educational Administration in Georgia institutions (90%). Traditionally, the Master of Arts (M.A.) or Master of Science (M.S.) is a degree which stresses research and academic reporting skills somewhat more than technical-applied skills in the M.Ed. program.

- Admission Requirements: Generally, the Georgia educational administration programs have uniform minimum admission requirements. Georgia Southern College and West Georgia College look for 100 additional points on the Graduate Record Examination (G.R.E.), combined verbal and quantitative score as a minimum--900 rather than 800. Most minimum undergraduate grade point averages (G.P.A.) are computed using the grades from the last two undergraduate years or the courses which correspond primarily to the student's major field. Professional teaching experience is generally considered a helpful prerequisite to administrator preparation. Although the State of Georgia requires 3 years teaching experience for AS-5 certification, most graduate programs choose not to require experience in order to undertake graduate study. Georgia Southern and Emory do require professional recommendations attesting to a candidate's administrative and leadership aptitude and academic competence--one element of an admission screen which this review has shown to be the trend nationally as well.

- Provisional Admission: It is nearly standard practice for colleges and universities to grant provisional admission to a small percentage of students (usually 10%) who fall below some minimum admission requirements but who otherwise show aptitude and promise in their chosen field. Many allow the student to demonstrate ability to do good graduate-level work by allowing them to take introductory (foundation) courses on a limited basis. If these provisionally admitted students achieve "B" grades, the course credits are accepted toward their degree program upon formal regular admission. (An exception is Georgia Southern College.) Another approach to an alternative admission route is a departmental "preliminary" examination which can measure aptitudes, skills, and experience the faculty deem necessary for successful completion of a program.

- Teaching Methodologies Used: Details regarding teaching methods and procedures in the Georgia programs cannot be fully documented in the absence of complete interviews of faculty and staff in the various programs. Examination of primary source materials (graduate catalogues and supplementary program descriptions) and random telephone interviews did reveal a predominantly traditional lecture/discussion format, with small group discussion, simulations/role playing, individual/group research, and internship/field-based practicum accounting for perhaps 10-15% of credit hour time.

- Program Differentiation on the Basis of Varying Student Goals Or A Set Required Core, Major, and Special Requirements Sequence: It is the general practice of educational administration departments in Georgia to define a "core" of coursework as "Foundations." This introductory sequence includes various perspectives in educational psychology and some aspect of sociology of education. Four departments (Atlanta University, Georgia Southern College, Georgia State University, and Valdosta State College) expand the "core" concept and require additional coursework related to programs and curriculum of the school and analytical/research methods as part of this foundations sequence. Students beginning the introductory sequence at Georgia State University are required to complete a two-course sequence, "Concepts and Practices of Educational Administration I and II," with a grade of "B" or better in order to continue in the degree program.

A common program pattern both within Georgia and nationally (See Piper, 1983) is to have Master's and Specialist's/Certification programs built on a common core with additional core courses arranged by position goal (elementary, secondary, or district level) and the remainder of the courses individualized on an elective basis. In Georgia, seven M.Ed. programs allow few electives and, therefore, specify a detailed required course structure. Four M.Ed. programs are more highly individualized with fewer set requirements beyond the basic core.

- Internship/Field Experience: Six Departments of Educational Administration consider the internship/field experience a necessary and useful component of the M.Ed. (level 5) administrator training program. This clinical experience is required of practicing administrators as well as those without prior administrative experience. On-the-job requirements (if applicable) are normally not considered adequate to fulfill the expectations of a clinical project where the goal is student demonstration of leadership and management competencies in a real-life school setting. (See "Clinical Projects" description, Columbia Teachers College, 1982, Appendix).

- Residency Requirements: A residency is required in all Georgia programs at the Master's level and is generally defined as the minimum number of quarter or semester hours (example: 45 hours of 60 total hours) a student must take at the degree-granting institution. The difference in credits can be one or a combination of the following: department approved transfer credit for previous "B" level graduate work in the appropriate area; credit obtained through advance standing providing the student passes a departmental proficiency examination in the area; credit obtained at another campus of the University of Georgia System.

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
NCATE Accreditation 1984	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
ADMISSION CRITERIA						
Bachelor's Degree (B.A., B.S./Ed.)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher Certification (T-4)	---	---	YES*	YES	YES	YES
OR						
Prerequisites for Certification	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Recommendation/School Administration	---	---	---	---	YES	---
Professional Experience (3 Years Teaching for AS-5)	OPT.	OPT.	YES*	OPT.	YES	NO
Undergraduate Grade Point Average (GPA)--Minimum	2.5	2.5	2.75	2.5	2.5	2.5
Graduate Record Examination Score (GRE)--Minimum	800	800	800	800	900	800
Miller's Analogy Test Score (MAT)--Minimum	44	44	44	44	44	44
National Teacher's Examination Score (NTE)--Minimum ("Common" section)	550	550	550	550	550	550

*Effective Fall Quarter, 1985, for students seeking the L-5 certificate. (Columbus College)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
NCATE Accreditation 1984	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
ADMISSION CRITERIA					
Bachelor's Degree (B.A., B.S./Ed.)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher Certification (T-4)	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES[1]
Prerequisites for Certification	YES	YES	YES	---	---
Recommendation/School Administration	---	---	---	YES	YES
Professional Experience (3 Years Teaching for AS-5)	NO	NO	YES	1 Yr.	1 Yr.[2]
Undergraduate Grade Point Average (GPA)--Minimum	2.6	2.5	2.5	3.0[3]	Note[4]
Graduate Record Examination Score (GRE)--Minimum	800	800	900	NO	800
Miller's Analogy Test Score (MAT)--Minimum	44	44	48	NO	---
National Teacher's Examination Score (NTE)--Minimum ("Common" section)	550	550	575	---	---

Programs in Georgia
Master's Level
Notes (B)

1. Master's level professional certification, Georgia T-5 or equivalent from another state, or if concurrent Master's level enrollment (required for entry with a Baccalaureate degree only)--Baccalaureate level professional certification, Georgia T-4 or equivalent from another state, in proposed area of graduate study or one complementary to it. (Emory University)

2. All students must be concurrently enrolled in a program leading to advanced certification in a teaching field, as well as AS certification.

   a) Full-time graduate study--Minimum 1 year prior teaching experience.
   b) Part-time graduate study--Minimum 1 year prior teaching experience or full-time teaching concurrently.
   c) Maximum 1 semester (quarter) graduate work summer prior to full-time teaching in fall.

   To ascertain academic and professional promise--three Graduate School Rating Sheets must be submitted by persons familiar with the applicant's academic and professional performance, i.e. the school principal, instructional supervisor, and an academic advisor or professor. Written assessment of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses relative to the proposed program of study, including a minimum overall rating of "excellent" from each rater is required. (Emory University)

3. 3.0 GPA in area of concentration. (Atlanta University)

4. 2.0 GPA overall; 3.0 GPA in area of concentration. (Emory University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
PROVISIONAL ADMISSION CRITERIA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Fifteen (15) Hours of "B" Work	YES	YES	YES*	YES	YES	YES
Departmental Examination	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Departmental Examination with Consultation "Mastery" Level	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Undergraduate GPA	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
GRE Score--Minimum	700	700	700	700	800	700
MAT Score--Minimum	---	27	35	30	36	33
NTE Score--Minimum	450	450	450	450	500	---

*Must include Research in Education (EDU 631) and at least one other core course. (Columbus College)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
PROVISIONAL ADMISSION CRITERIA	Post BA	YES	YES	YES[1]	YES[2]
Fifteen (15) Hours of "B" Work	---	YES	YES	N/A	Note[3]
Departmental Examination	NO	NO	YES	N/A	N/A
Departmental Examination with Consultation "Mastery" Level	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A
Undergraduate GPA	2.2	2.2	2.2	N/A	N/A
GRE Score--Minimum	700	700	700	N/A	N/A
MAT Score--Minimum	30	27	---	N/A	N/A
NTE Score--Minimum	450	450	---	N/A	N/A

Programs in Georgia
Master's Level
Notes (D)

1. Conditional admission with departmental approval. Twelve hours of "B" work accepted toward degree. No specified minimum scores or grade point average--conditional admission is based upon individual consideration by departmental committee, (Atlanta University)

2. Written requests for waiver of any admission criterion including supporting evidence are considered in faculty committee. (Emory University)

3. A limited number of graduate students can be admitted in special standing with a bachelor's degree from an accredited college, and an overall grade point average of "C" or better. If a student in special standing later wishes to enter a degree program, the student must reapply for admission to the Graduate School. No work completed in special standing may be applied toward a degree. (Emory University)

E

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
PROGRAM OF STUDY	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.Ed.
Number of Hours Required	60	60	60	60	60	60
Special Requirements	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
Foundation Coursework "B" for Regular Admission	NO	NO	NO[1]	NO	NO	YES[2]
Advisor Approval of Ability/Coursework Plan	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
Preliminary Examination	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES[3]	NO
Transfer Credit--Maximum Number Allowed	15	15	10	15	10	NOTE[4]
Required Core Courses	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

1. Effective Fall Quarter, 1985, revised program admission criteria for L-5 certification students will require that at least by the completion of 15 quarter hours, Ed.S. admission standards must be met (i.e., 3.5 graduate GPA, a score of 48 on the MAT, completion of three years teaching experience, and T-5 in a teaching field). (Columbus College)
2. All students are required to complete the two-course sequence EAS 700-701. (Georgia State University)
3. Advisor Discretion. (Georgia Southern College)
4. Only if greater than 45 hours residency. (Georgia State University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
PROGRAM OF STUDY	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.A.	M.Ed.[1]
Number of Hours Required	60[2]	60	60	39	44-48
Special Requirements	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Foundation Coursework "B" for Regular Admission	NO	NO	YES	NO[3]	NO
Advisor Approval of Ability/Coursework Plan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES[4]
Preliminary Examination	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Transfer Credit--Maximum Number Allowed	10	10	10	6	1 Sem.
Required Core Courses	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Programs in Georgia
Master's Level
Notes (F)

1. Degree requirements and certification requirements are not necessarily the same, although the programs in the Division of Educational Studies are approved for advanced certification in Georgia. Graduate students at Emory University must complete either an M.A., M.A.T. (Master of Arts in Teaching), or an M.Ed. in their major teaching field (a "Master Teacher" approach), either prior to entry into the Educational Leadership sequence or concurrently within the program. The academic course of study in leadership is integrated with a sequence of field experiences designed to develop leadership potential based on extending teaching field competence. (Emory University)

2. Plan "B"=60 hours, Plan "A"=55 hours with research course and applied project. (University of Georgia)

3. Plans for an introductory sequence of foundation coursework in educational administration which focuses upon the potential administrator's skills and abilities are nearly completed (Fall, 1984). (Atlanta University)

4. A weekly conference between the candidate and the college supervisor is required, for guidance and program planning and to ascertain whether performance standards are being maintained for continuation. (Emory University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
PROGRAM OF STUDY	Continued					
Majority of Courses Required with Few Electives	YES	NO	NO[1]	NO	YES	YES
Majority of Courses Elective with Advisor Consent	NO	YES	YES[1]	YES	NO	NO
Internship/Field Experience Required	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO[3]
Supervision Course Required	YES	YES	NO[2]	YES	YES	YES
Curriculum Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Special Education Course Required (if not previously satisfied)	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Research Methods Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Statistics Course Required	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Educational Measurement Course Required	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

1. Effective Fall Quarter, 1985, all students seeking the L-5 certificate will be required to complete a 30 hour major area core of coursework in addition to general degree requirements. (Columbus College)
2. To be required, effective Fall Quarter, 1985. (Columbus College)
3. Beginning Fall, 1985, the internship will be included within a more highly structured degree program. (Georgia State University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
PROGRAM OF STUDY	Continued				
Majority of Courses Required with Few Electives	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Majority of Courses Elective with Advisor Consent	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Internship/Field Experience Required	YES-A	NO*	YES	YES	YES
Supervision Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Curriculum Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Special Education Course Required (if not previously satisfied)	YES	YES	YES	NO**	YES
Research Methods Course Required	YES	YES-core	YES	YES	YES
Statistics Course Required	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Educational Measurement Course Required	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES

*As of fall quarter 1984-85 the internship, previously an elective, is strongly recommended. A committee is revising the M.Ed. program to make the internship a requirement. (Valdosta State College)
**Not required for degree purposes, but available for certification. (Atlanta University)

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DISTRIBUTION
Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
Foundations	10	15	10	10*	10	10
Educational Psychology	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sociology	5	5	5	5	---	5
Other	---	5	---	---	5	---
Major	35	25	30	30	30	35
Educational Administration	5	10	E**	5	5	10
Educational Leadership	5					
Skills Development/Staff Development	5	E	E**	E	5	E
Technical Aspects, i.e., Law, Finance, Planning, etc.	5	E	E**	E	5	E

*A 20 hour "Professional Education" consists of the following coursework: Social Foundations or Philosophical Foundations (5 hrs.); Educational Research (5 hrs.); Advanced Studies in Learning (5 hrs.); and Curriculum Planning (5 hrs.). (Georgia College)

**To be required as part of the 30-hour major area core, effective Fall Quarter, 1985. (Columbus College)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DISTRIBUTION

Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
Foundations	10	15	15	3	8*
Educational Psychology	5	5	5	3	E
Sociology	5	5	5	3	E
Other	---	5	E	---	E
Major	25	30	30	27	16
Educational Administration	5	10	10	6	4
Educational Leadership					
Skills Development/Staff Development	E	E	E	3	E
Technical Aspects, i.e., Law, Finance, Planning, etc.	E	E	5	3	E

*Specific coursework requirements by category are organized according to individual student career goals and experience in consultation with faculty in the Department of Educational Studies. (Emory University)

133

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
Supervision	5	10	E[1]	5	10	5
Curriculum & Methods or Curriculum Development	5	5	5	5	5	5
Research Methods	5	5	5[2]	5	10	5
Statistics/Educational Research	---	---	---	---	5	---
Computer Technology	---	---	---	E	5	---
Testing and Evaluation	---	---	---	---	---	---
Field Experience/Internship	5	E	E	E	5	E (1-10)[3]
Electives (Cognate Areas)	10	15	15	5	5	10
Core of Courses Offered for Add-On Certification for AS-5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Hours for Add-On (if holding a T-5)	30	30	30	30	30	30

1. To be required as part of 30-hour major area core, effective Fall Quarter, 1985. (Columbus College)
2. Must be taken within first 20 quarter hours. (Columbus College)
3. Beginning Fall, 1985, an internship will become a formal component of the degree program. (Georgia State University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
Supervision	5	10	5	3	4
Curriculum & Methods or Curriculum Development	5	5	E	3	E
Research Methods	5	5	5	6	8
Statistics/Educational Research	E	---	---	3	E
Computer Technology	E	---	---	---	E
Testing and Evaluation	---	---	---	---	4
Field Experience/Internship	E (1-15)	E	5	3	4-8
Electives (Cognate Areas)	---	10	10	9*	4
Core of Courses Offered for Add-On Certification for AS-5	YES	YES	---	YES	NO
Number of Hours for Add-On (if holding a T-5)	30	30	---	---	**

*6 hours may apply to thesis. (Atlanta University) **No add-ons are accepted. (Emory University)

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Albany State College	Augusta College	Columbus College	Georgia College	Georgia Southern College	Georgia State University
EXIT CRITERIA	YES	YES	YES	---	YES	YES
Master's Thesis or Project Required	NO	NO	NO	---	NO	NO
Written Comprehensive Examination	YES	NO	YES	---	YES	YES
Oral Comprehensive Examination (by Committee)	NO	YES	NO	*	NO	*
COMPLETION Minimum Requirements for M.Ed.						
Overall GPA	---	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Minimum Residence Credits	---	45	30	30	45	45
Maximum Time Period (Years)	6	6	6	6	6	6

*If deemed necessary by department

PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Georgia	Valdosta State College	West Georgia College	Atlanta University (Semester)	Emory University (Semester)
EXIT CRITERIA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Master's Thesis or Project Required	"A"	NO	NO	NO	NO
Written Comprehensive Examination	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES and/or
Oral Comprehensive Examination (by Committee)	YES	*	YES	---	YES
COMPLETION Minimum Requirements for M.Ed.					
Overall GPA	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Minimum Residence Credits	25	30	30	33	3 Sem.
Maximum Time Period (Years)	6	6	6	6	**

*If deemed necessary by department. **Four semesters is usual completion time due to inservice teacher's internship and teaching responsibilities. (Emory University)

Research Procedures for Pyramid Study

This section presents a review, with supplemental materials, of a national sample of university graduate programs in educational administration selected by executive directors of national associations and prominent educational researchers identified by their colleagues. The research procedure employed is often referred to as a "pyramid study" and incorporated the following telephone interview progression.

Using the top ten graduate institutions listed in the 1983-84 edition of the Gourman Report as a beginning frame of reference, the following executive directors of national education associations were asked for their professional opinions concerning this question: Which ten graduate preparation programs in educational administration and supervision do you believe prepare exceptionally capable school principals and superintendents--people who are school and community leaders in qualitative educational improvement?

David Imig--American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

Paul Salmon--American Association of School Administrators (AASA)

Samuel G. Sava--National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)

Scott D. Thomson--National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)

Don Cameron--National Education Association (NEA)

Graduate preparation programs in educational administration which were ultimately chosen for this review represent the integration of the following three sources of information and professional opinion: a) programs mentioned most often by the executive directors listed above; b) programs mentioned most often by prominent researchers in education and social science (who were also identified by the executive directors); and c) programs mentioned most often among the professional colleagues of the primary researchers interviewed--researcher/practitioners who are working in other well-regarded educational administration preparation programs nationally.

The following professors of educational administration (predominantly K-12) were recommended by their colleagues as useful resource persons for this review. (The programs in which they teach and conduct research were also identified as exemplary.)

Dr. Julio George--University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Dr. Ben Harris--University of Texas-Austin

Dr. John Hoyle--Texas A&M University

Dr. James Lipham--University of Wisconsin-Madison

Dr. Dale Mann--Columbia Teachers College

Dr. Lloyd McCleary--University of Utah-Salt Lake City

Dr. Paula Silver--University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign

The following graduate preparation programs in education with majors in Administration and Supervision were most often included is discussion with professional educators contacted and are listed in alphabetical order:

University of California-Berkeley
Columbia University Teachers College
University of Florida-Gainesville*
Harvard University
University of Illinois--Urbana/Champaign
New York University
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Ohio State University
University of Texas-Austin
University of Utah-Salt Lake City
University of Washington-Seattle
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Upon review and examination of demographic data collected by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission in a study of the principalship and the superintendency in Georgia, two regional institutions outside the Georgia State University System were shown to have educated a number of principals and superintendents presently serving in schools and school districts in Georgia, and were, therefore, included in this review. Those programs are Auburn University and the University of Tennessee-Chattanooga.

The Stanford University program in Administration and Policy Analysis was often mentioned by the educators contacted, with the caveat that the Stanford focus is highly research and scholarship oriented. Administrative practice is also a strong component of the Stanford Program, but telephone inquiries made it clear that most graduate students in the program seek the doctorate with administrative/analytical (institutional research) or other research positions as career goals, rather than principal and/or superintendent position goals.

---

*The University of Florida-Gainesville was chosen by the professional educators contacted as an SREB institution for comparative purposes.

Stanford's Administrative Credential Program is currently under review; state approval is being sought for a program which would make it possible for a student to complete the credential requirements in three or four quarters. Program descriptions and the Stanford philosophy regarding their approach to this program are included in the Appendix.

National Educational Administration Programs: Some Observations

- NCATE Accreditation: Of the fourteen educational administration preparation programs reviewed as a national sample, twelve are NCATE accredited at the Master's level. The University of Utah-Salt Lake City is NCATE accredited at the Superintendent and Doctoral levels. Both the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Wisconsin-Madison are not NCATE accredited. These two institutions presently are engaged in a formal review and appeal of the NCATE accreditation process in general and are questioning the professional expertise of NCATE site-review committees in particular.

- Degrees Offered: The Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree is the most common Master's level degree awarded in this sample of educational administration programs, offered in seven of the fourteen programs. Five confer the Master of Arts (M.A.) degree which includes a somewhat more theoretical/research emphasis associated with the M.A. The remaining two, the University of Washington-Seattle and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, award the Master of Science (M.S.) degree and stress academic research and experimental investigation through empirical research in a field-study mode somewhat more than the M.A. or the M.Ed.

- Admission Requirements: Minimum admission requirements for graduate study in educational administration are generally similar but vary in terms of the "weight" given each criteria as viewed by individual faculty committees and departmental policy. For instance, seven of the fourteen programs reviewed, or 50%, specifically require at least a "B" undergraduate grade point average (GPA) or 3.0 (usually computed using the last two years of undergraduate study, or courses in the major field of concentration). Four list GPA minimums between 2.5 and 2.7. One other, Auburn University, uses a very specific algebraic formula in which GPA and graduate aptitude/professional knowledge test scores are incorporated into a minimum admission criteria score. Still other school/departments prefer not to specify minimum admission scores on tests or minimum grade point averages either in their graduate catalogues or when asked by telephone. Reasons stated are not secrecy or obfuscation but rather the school or department's sincere effort to attract well-rounded individuals to school leadership graduate study. Students who demonstrate promise and exceptional ability through professional experience and the recommendations of colleagues as well as prior academic performance or ability to test well are actively recruited. Many departments also value the addition of graduate students from varied cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

- Provisional Admission: Information was sparse concerning the procedures for granting provisional admission status to a small percentage of students who fall below some minimum admission requirement. Interviewees stated that the procedures are used carefully, and the departmental philosophies reflect those stated previously under "Admission Requirements."

  It may be interesting to note that both the University of Texas-Austin and the University of Utah-Salt Lake City programs, which employ some of the most innovative/cooperative approaches to the integration of theory, research, and practice, also use "provisional admission status" for novice graduate students. All new students must demonstrate their intellectual, emotional, and leadership acumen in specially designed administrative "core" courses prior to receiving full graduate student status.

- Teaching Methodolgies Used: As in the review of Georgia preservice educational administration programs, specific details which outline the mix of teaching/learning methodologies cannot be fully documented at this time. More in-depth interviews of the faculty, staff, and, possibly, students involved in the programs would be necessary. Individual course and specific program descriptions contained in the primary source materials (graduate catalogues and graduate student information materials) provided a basic picture of types and methods of instruction. In addition, telephone interviews with each departmental chairperson during initial contacts and often later for clarification revealed instructional patterns which varied according to departmental philosophy concerning the mix of theory and practice. Interviewees stated that faculties which agree that most of the theoretical training of administrators should reflect actual practice tend to make more use (20-50% of credit hour time) of small group discussion, simulation/role-playing, individual/group field research, and graduate "capstone" seminars where candidates share and evaluate their experiences from their internships and field-based practicums.

  Department chairpersons also commented that technical subject areas such as school finance, school law, educational psychology, educational sociology, and learning theory most often lend themselves to the traditional lecture/discussion format. According to the department heads interviewed, as students become more involved in active scholarly research as applied to these technical fields, teaching methodologies move toward more active participation of graduate students in learning activities. For example, in the programs at the Universities of Utah, Columbia, Harvard, and Texas at Austin, students both participate in and operate continuing seminars dealing with current issues in educational administration.

- Program Differentiation on the Basis of Varying Student Goals Or a Set Required Core, Major, and Special Requirements Sequence: This national sample of degree programs in educational administration generally follows the overall national pattern with regard to the inclusion of a prescribed "core" sequence. However, some of the educational administration departments in this national sample (such as those at the Universities of Utah-Salt Lake City, Texas-Austin, North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Columbia Teachers College, and Harvard) have programs which represent a reorganization and redefinition of the traditional approaches to the education and training of potential school administrators. These programs have introductory "core" sequences (required for all degree levels) which serve multiple purposes: formal assessment of students' leadership potential and entry-level competencies, foundation coursework in conjunction with ongoing practitioner involvement in instruction; peer group interation and shared assessment of developing leadership abilities; and introductory field research and application.

  For example, the University of Utah-Salt Lake City has folded traditional "Foundation" course material into an integrated sequence of coursework and practical application which it calls the "Core of Administrative Learnings." Included in Utah's redefined and required introductory core are the areas of: organization and governance; human and fiscal resources; programs and curriculum; and analytical methods. Similarly, Columbia University Teachers College, in 1976, reorganized all of its administration curriculum, for all licenses and for all jurisdictions, into a single, comprehensive, competency-based plan. Columbia uses the four categories listed above, with some modifications, as its organizational framework.

  The majority of the programs in the national sample are more traditional in program format at the Master's level. All have a required introductory core sequence. Ten specify course requirements throughout the rest of a candidate's program and allow few electives in the minor area other than those which correspond to position goal (district level, secondary, elementary). Candidates are encouraged to take the few elective credits allowed in departments outside of education, such as business, psychology, public affairs, political science, and law. One program (Ohio State University) divides the number of required/elective courses about evenly. Auburn University and the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign allow for more individual freedom in program design; department chairpersons interviewed stated that is a reflection of a their states' wider variety of state certification standards for each administrative category and a need to allow for individualized program planning based upon a candidate's career goal. Although Harvard University's preparation programs are highly selective and individualized, it is possible for an individual student to accommodate new Massachusetts administrator certification requirements (September, 1982) within the program offerings. However, the Massachusetts certification requirements are detailed and competency-based, and the State has not approved the Harvard course listings for certification at this time (Fall, 1984).

- Internship/Field Experiences: Seven Departments of Educational Administration in this national sample consider the internship/field experience a necessary and useful component of a Master's level administrator preservice program. This clinical experience is designed to provide on-the-job training as well as the opportunity to demonstrate administrative competence. Most of the programs reviewed specified that a candidate will likely complete a clinical project in the school or school district within which he/she is working and that often the project will have a relationship to job responsibilities. A responsible official in the field setting approves the project and serves as an on-site resource or associate in connection with its conduct. In addition, the student is expected to use the related professional literature in the development of a contextual framework for the analysis and interpretion of the data and practical experience relevant to the field problem under investigation.

Nationally, field experiences generally are singular--one extensive project plus a report is the usual requirement. At Columbia Teachers College, however, students who seek the department's recommendation for administrative certification in New York State are required to complete one clinical project in each of the four areas of departmental emphasis (Organizational Behavior; Management Science; Policy Analysis and Action; and Institutional Analysis and Action).

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
NCATE Accreditation 1984	YES	NO[1]	YES	YES	YES
ADMISSION CRITERIA--Degrees Awarded	M.S.	M.A.	M.Ed.[2]	M.Ed.[3]	Ed.M.
Bachelor's Degree (B.A., B.S./Ed.)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher Certification (T-4)	for	only for	only for	YES	for
Prerequisites for Certification	Cert.	Cert.	Cert.	---	Cert.
Professional Administrative/Teaching Experience	Cert.	Cert.	Cert.	YES	YES
Admission/Counseling Interview	YES	---	YES	---	NO
Undergraduate Grade Point Average (GPA)--Minimum	Note[4]	3.0	"B"	3.0	3.0
Graduate Record Examination Score (GRE)--Minimum	Note[4]	YES	YES	1000	YES or
Miller's Analogy Test Score (MAT)--Minimum	NO	---	---	Note[5]	YES
Other Criteria (Personal Essay)	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (A)

1. The Berkeley School of Education is presently engaged in a major revitalization process including the addition of new faculty, program expansion, and the development of major new efforts in research, school districts, and new courses. (University of California-Berkeley)

2. The M.A. Degree does not satisfy New York State certification requirements. The majority of Educational Administration students at Columbia Teachers College enter the Ed.D. competency-based Preparation of Administrators Program with an M.A. or Ed.M. The M.A. in Educational Administration requires 32 points (semester hours) without an essay or 30 points (semester hours) with an essay, while the Ed.M. is awarded along the way to the Ed.D. and requires 60 points (semester hours), 30 of which must be taken at the Teachers College. The New York State Department of Education has mandated (1976) competency-based administrator certification rather than merely a number of graduate courses completed, and the CTC's competency-based plan of studies features extensive field-based preparation as well as coursework in the following areas: Organizational Behavior, Management Science, Institutional Analysis and Action, and Policy Analysis and Action. Please see Appendix for additional information. (Columbia Teachers College)

3. M.Ed. degree does not require a thesis; the MA.E. degree does require a thesis. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

4. A student must rate a satisfactory score based on the following formula: $[2V + Q + 3AT + 1500(GPA-1)]/10 = 500$. The variables are defined as follows: V=Verbal score on GRE, Q=Quantitative score on GRE, AT=Advanced Test score in education (on GRE), and the GPA=Undergraduate grade point average based on the 4.0 scale. (Auburn University)

5. For conditional admission. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
NCATE Accreditation 1984	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ADMISSION CRITERIA--Degrees Awarded	Ed.M.[1]	M.A.	M.Ed.	M.A.	M.Ed.
Bachelor's Degree (B.A., B.S./Ed.)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher Certification (T-4)	only for Cert.	only for Cert.	only for Cert.	only for Cert.	YES or YES
Prerequisites for Certification					
Professional Administrative/Teaching Experience	Cert.	Cert.	Cert.	Cert.	3 Yrs.
Admission/Counseling Interview	YES	YES	YES	---	YES
Undergraduate Grade Point Average (GPA)--Minimum	"B"	2.5	3.0	2.7	2.5
Graduate Record Examination Score (GRE)--Minimum	NO	Note[2]	1000	Note[3]	YES or YES
Miller's Analogy Test Score (MAT)--Minimum	YES	---	---	---	
Other Criteria (Personal Essay)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (B)

1. The University of Illinois offers the A.M. and M.S. degrees for students with research interests, usually with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. as a goal. (University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign)
2. GRE scores are required for doctoral students (New York University)
3. If the grade point average is less than 2.7. (Ohio State)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
NCATE Accreditation 1984	YES	YES	YES	NO
ADMISSION CRITERIA--Degrees Awarded	M.A.*	M.Ed.	M.Ed.	M.S.*
Bachelor's Degree (B.A.)	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher Certification (T-4)	YES	For Cert. in Admin.	YES	For Cert. in Admin.
Prerequisites for Certification				
Professional Administrative/Teaching Experience	YES	YES	Cert.	Cert.
Admission/Counseling Interview	YES	YES	---	---
Undergraduate Grade Point Average (GPA)--Minimum	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.75
Graduate Record Examination Score (GRE)--Minimum	1000 or	YES or	YES or	1000 or
Miller's Analogy Test Score (MAT)--Minimum	YES	YES	YES	56
Other Criteria (Personal Essay)	---	YES	YES	YES

*For Professional Certification

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
Special Requirements (i.e. Written English Proficiency Exam)	YES	Note[1]	NO	NO	NO
Letters of Recommendation	---	3	2	YES	3
Faculty Interview	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Educational Administration Core Courses (as screen for certification and practice)	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Provisional Admission (Availability)	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Residency Requirement	---	2 Sem.	---	16 Credits	---
PROGRAM OF STUDY	QTR.	SEM.	SEM.	SEM.	SEM.
Minimum Number of Hours Required	52[2]	24-30[3]	30-32	36	32-44

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (D)

1. The California Basic Educational Skills Test (C-BEST), applicable tests within the C-BEST program (see Appendix) and the National Teachers Examination (NTE) are required for certification in California. (University of California-Berkeley)

2. Forty-eight (48) quarter hours are required for certification as a Principal (AES) N-6 grades and 7-12 grades. Fifty-two (52) quarter hours are required for a Principal (AES) N-12 grades. (Auburn University)

3. Plan I = 24 semester units and a thesis. Twelve units must be in 200 (advanced) series courses in Education. The 12 remaining units must be either 100 or 200 series courses in Education or related departments, and must include two of the Educational Foundations courses. Plan II = 30 semester units, and a Written Seminar Study or Written Comprehensive Examiniation. Fifteen units must be in 200 series courses in Education. The 15 remaining units must be 100 or 200 series courses in Education or related departments, and include two Educational Foundations courses. (University of California-Berkeley)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Special Requirements (i.e. Written English Proficiency Exam)	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
Letters of Recommendation	3	---	3	3	3
Faculty Interview	YES	---	YES	---	---
Educational Administration Core Courses (as screen for certification and practice)	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Provisional Admission (Availability)	YES	NO	---	YES	YES
Residency Requirement	32 Credits	24 pts.	2 Sem.	YES	50%
PROGRAM OF STUDY	SEM.	SEM.	SEM.	QTR.	SEM.
Minimum Number of Hours Required	Note[1]	34	30-34	45/50[2]	33

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (E)

1. Certification Requirements = 32 hours, Degree = 40 hours. (University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign)
2. Plan A = 45 quarter hours with a thesis. Plan B = 50 quarter hours without a thesis. (Ohio State University)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
Special Requirements (i.e. Written English Proficiency Exam)	---	---	---	YES
Letters of Recommendation	3	3	3	3
Faculty Interview	YES	YES	OPT.	---
Educational Administration Core Courses (as screen for certification and practice)	---	YES	YES	YES
Provisional Admission (Availability)	YES	YES	NO	YES
Residency Requirement	2 Sem.	---	---	2 Sem.
PROGRAM OF STUDY	SEM.	QTR.	QTR.	SEM.
Minimum Number of Hours Required	45	55	48	30

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
Special Requirements	YES	Plan I or II	YES	YES[1]	YES[8]
Thesis Option	YES[2]	YES[3]	YES[4]	YES[5]	NO
Non-Thesis Option	NO	YES[6]	YES[7]	YES	NO
Field-Study, Research, Seminar, or Special Assignment	YES	YES	YES	---	YES
Advisor Approval of Ability/Coursework Plan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Department Preliminary Examination	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Transfer Credit--Maximum Number Allowed	---	4	NONE	6	NONE
Required Core Courses	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Majority Required--Few Electives	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Majority Electives--Advisor Consent	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Internship/Field Experience Required	Cert.	Cert.	Cert.	NO	YES

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (G)

1. A reading-instruction requirement must be met for certification. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

2. Required. (Auburn University)

3. With 24 semester hours. (University of California-Berkeley)

4. With 30 semester hours. (Columbia University Teachers College)

5. For M.A. only. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

6. With 30 semester hours. (University of California-Berkeley)

7. With 32 semester hours. (Columbia University Teachers College)

8. New Massachusetts certification requirements (effective September, 1982) include specific competencies for the roles of superintendent, assistant superintendent, or principal. The Harvard Graduate School of Education has attempted to translate its courses into the State's Standards and Competencies, but as of this writing (Fall, 1984) the HGSE's listing is not approved by the State and therefore, serves as a guide to graduate students who wish to plan coursework which will also satisfy certification requirements. The coursework areas listed, therefore, represent those courses and concentration areas necessary for State certification, with the understanding that individual plans of study submitted to the Massachusetts DOE for approval are the responsibility of the student. (Harvard University)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Special Requirements	YES	YES	YES	Plan A or B[1]	YES
Thesis Option	NO	YES	M.A.	Plan A	YES
Non-Thesis Option	NO	YES	YES	Plan B	YES
Field-Study, Research, Seminar, or Special Assignment	NO	M.A.	YES	YES	YES
Advisor Approval of Ability/Coursework Plan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Department Preliminary Examination	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Transfer Credit--Maximum Number Allowed	10[2]	10	---	A=9 B=10	YES[3]
Required Core Courses	YES	YES	YES[4]	YES	YES
Majority Required--Few Electives	NO	YES	YES	50/50	YES
Majority Electives--Advisor Consent	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Internship/Field Experience Required	Cert.	NO	YES	YES	YES

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (H)

1. Plan A = Thesis and 45 hours; Plan B = Non-Thesis/Field Study or Research Seminar and 50 hours. (Ohio State University)

2. Advanced Certificate and Ed.M. students may transfer up to 2-1/2 units of credits (10 hours). A.M. and M.S. students may not transfer credit. (University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign)

3. Six (6) credits outside of University of Tennessee; 50% of total within University of Tennessee. (University of Tennessee-Chattanooga)

4. University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill's Division of Organizational Development and Institutional Studies (ODIS) defines the common core of coursework much differently than these charts can accommodate. The integrated base includes: Politics of Education, Structure and Behavior in Educational Organizations, Management in Educational Organizations, and Leadership Behavior and Organizational Change on Organizational Settings (total: 12 credits). See Appendix for details. (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
Special Requirements	YES	YES	YES	YES
Thesis Option	NO	DNA*	YES	DNA
Non-Thesis Option	YES	DNA	YES	DNA
Field-Study, Research, Seminar, or Special Assignment	YES	YES	YES	DNA
Advisor Approval of Ability/Coursework Plan	YES	YES**	YES	YES
Department Preliminary Examination	NO	YES	NO	NO
Transfer Credit--Maximum Number Allowed	6	9	25% or 9	YES***
Required Core Courses	YES	YES	YES	YES
Majority Required--Few Electives	YES	YES	YES	YES
Majority Electives--Advisor Consent	NO	NO	NO	NO
Internship/Field Experience Required	YES	YES	YES	YES

*DNA = Does not apply. **With assessment. ***9 outside of Univ. of Wisconsin; 12 within Univ. of Wisconsin.

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
Supervision Course Required	YES	---*	YES	YES	Cert.
Curriculum Course Required	NO	---	YES	YES	YES
Special Education Course Required (Unless previously satisfied)	YES	---	YES	---	NO
Research Methods Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
(as part of Foundations)	YES	---	NO	---	NO
Statistics Required	NO	YES	YES	E	E
Educational Measurement Required	NO	---	YES	NO	E

*As noted earlier, the University of California-Berkely School of Education is presently engaged in a program renewal process; degree requirements and school district/university cooperative efforts including field-based components are a part of new program planning. However, specific information regarding course requirements is presently not available.

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Supervision Course Required	NO	YES	Cert.	YES	YES
Curriculum Course Required	NO	NO	Cert.	YES	YES
Special Education Course Required (Unless previously satisfied)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Research Methods Required	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
(as part of Foundations)	—	NO	NO	NO	YES
Statistics Required	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Educational Measurement Required	NO	NO	NO	Optional	NO

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
Supervision Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES
Curriculum Course Required	YES	YES	YES	YES
Special Education Course Required (Unless previously satisfied)	NO	NO	YES	NO
Research Methods Required (as part of Foundations)	within program	YES YES*	YES YES	YES NO
Statistics Required	NO	YES	YES	YES
Educational Measurement Required	within program	YES	NO	NO

* A research design course (Ed Ad 656) is considered part of the core. University of Utah-Salt Lake City.

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
Foundations	8-12	6	3-6	3	8+
Educational Psychology	4	3	3	3	4
Sociology of Education	4	3	E	---	4
Other (Often Educational Research)	Note[1]	---	E	---	E[2]
Major	32-36	Note[3]	15-18	27	36+ Cert.
Educational Administration	5	---	6	18	24
Educational Leadership	5	---	3	3	4
Skills Development/Staff Development	---	---	3	E	4
Technical Aspects, i.e., Law, Finance, Planning, Community Relations, etc.	15	---	E	E	16

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (M)

1. EDL 699 Research and Thesis (credit to be arranged) is required for the M.S. program, and is in addition to other course requirements. Students admitted to the M.S. program must enroll for one hour of credit in EDL 699 from the time the plan of study is filed with the Graduate School. Enrollment in EDL 699 must be continuous from that point until graduation. At least 4 credits in research methods must also be included. (Auburn University)

2. Students seeking an Ed.M. with a concentration in School Leadership Studies must take 4 units of credit from each of the following categories: Enhancing Children's Learning and Development, Working with People, Managing the System, Developing a Theory of Schooling. For the State of Massachusetts certification as a school principal, the student must take a course in Sociology of Education and Philosophy of Education as part of Foundations. (Harvard University)

3. This information is presently not available. (University of California-Berkeley)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Foundations	8	12[1]	E[2]	9	6
Educational Psychology	4	3	---	3	---
Sociology of Education	4	3	---	3	3
Other (Often Educational Research)	---	(6)	---	3	3
Major	16 (Cert.)	7	18-21	12	18
Educational Administration	8	3	3	3	3
Educational Leadership			3		
Skills Development/Staff Development	4 (Cert.)	4	E	9	4
Technical Aspects, i.e., Law, Finance, Planning, Community Relations, etc.	12	E	3 and E	E	3

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (N)

1. See Appendix. (New York University)

2. A common core of coursework is required of all candidates pursuing courses of study leading to graduate degrees in Administration and Supervision (4 courses = 12 hours). This core includes: Politics of Education; Structure and Behavior in Educational Organizations; Management in Educational Organizations; and Leadership Behavior and Organizational Change in Organizational Settings. This core is considered a part of the 18-21 hours in the Major area of concentration; and 6-9 hours of elective credit is a part of this major area. Students have the option of the 9-12 semester hours in a Minor area of concentration. For the M.A., a 4-7 hours research sequence , which includes Design and Logic of Inquiry and Statistics, is optional. (Most M.A. students continue toward the Ph.D. and research.) For the M.Ed., a 4-7 hours research sequence is required. (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
Foundations	9-12	3	12	3
Educational Psychology	YES	3 OR	3	3
Sociology of Education	YES	3	3	—
Other (Often Educational Research)	9	(5)[1]	6	—
Major	15-18 (Core)	27	36	15
Educational Administration	(core)	6	18	3
Educational Leadership				
Skills Development/Staff Development	6	3	12	E
Technical Aspects, i.e., Law, Finance, Planning, Community Relations, etc.	within core	6	6	6

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (O)

1. The Perspectives on Educational Administration (an introductory course--5 hours) is intended to encourage the candidates to explore the meaning and purpose of administration, and become aware of the role and behavioral expectations that apply to administrative positions in schools. In this component candidates will assess their readiness for administration and will construct a personal profile of administrative interest and abilities. This will be accomplished through course discussion, structured field observation, and personal assessment. After the personal readiness and ability assessment some candidates may choose to terminate their work; others may be terminated by the deparment. (University of Utah-Salt Lake City)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION (cont'd)
Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
Supervision	5	---*	3-6	3	4
Curriculum Methods	4	---	E	6	E
Curriculum Development	---	---	E	E	4
Research Methods	4[1]	---	3-6	M.A.	4
Statistics/Ed. Research	--4[+]	---	YES	---	E
Computer Technology	---	---	YES	---	E
Testing & Evaluation	---	---	--E	---	E
Internship/Field Experience	5-15	---	Note [2]	NO	Note[3]
Electives (Cognate Areas)	4	---	3-6	6	OPT.
Electives Outside Education	NO	---	YES	YES	YES

*Information is presently not available.

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (P)

1. EDL 699 Research and Thesis (credit to be arranged) is required for the M.S. program, and is in addition to other course requirements. Students admitted to the M.S. program must enroll for one hour of credit in EDL 699 from the time the plan of study is filed with the Graduate School. Enrollment in EDL 699 must be continuous from that point until graduation. At least 4 credits in research methods must also be included. (Auburn University)

2. The M.A. Degree does not satisfy New York State certification requirements. The majority of Educational Administration students at Columbia Teachers College enter the Ed.D. competency-based Preparation of Administrators Program with an M.A. or Ed.M. The M.A. in Educational Administration requires 32 points (semester hours) without an essay or 30 points (semester hours) with an essay, while the Ed.M. is awarded along the way to the Ed.D. and requires 60 points (semester hours), 30 of which must be taken at the Teachers College. The New York State Department of Education has mandated (1976) competency-based administrator certification rather than merely a number of graduate courses completed, and the CTC's competency-based plan of studies features extensive field-based preparation as well as coursework in the following areas: Organizational Behavior, Management Science, Institutional Analysis and Action, and Policy Analysis and Action. Please see Appendix for additional information. (Columbia Teachers College)

3. State of Massachusetts requirement for school principal certification is completion of a half-practicum (150 clock hours) within one year, or an internship (300 clock hours) within two years, judged successful on the basis of specified standards and competency criteria. The Harvard School of Education requires field experience in connection with many of the required courses. (Harvard University)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION (cont'd) Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Supervision	4	3	3 for Cert.	3	3
Curriculum Methods	E			3	---
Curriculum Development	E	---	E	---	3
Research Methods	E	3	4-7	3	3-6
Statistics/Ed. Research	E	---	4[1]	---	NO
Computer Technology	E	---	---	E	---
Testing & Evaluation	E	---	---	---	NO
Internship/Field Experience	4 (Cert)	4	3-6	3 (Cert)	3
Electives (Cognate Areas)	Note[2]	15	OPT.	12-20[3]	3
Electives Outside Education	SOME	---	9-12	---	---

Out-of-State programs
Master's Level
Notes (Q)

1. An additional course in Logic is strongly suggested. (University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill)
2. As per area. (University of Ilinois-Urbana/Champaign)
3. Nine elective hours outside the College of Education relevant to entry positions in educational administration are recommended. (Ohio State University)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

COURSE DESCRIPTION (cont'd) Minimum Number of Hours by Category, E=Elective with Advisor's Consent	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
Supervision	9	3	3	3
Curriculum Methods	3	3	---	---
Curriculum Development	---	6	3	3
Research Methods	within program	6	6	3
Statistics/Ed. Research	NO	YES	YES	YES
Computer Technology	OPT.	OPT.	YES	OPT.
Testing & Evaluation	within program	YES	YES	OPT.
Internship/Field Experience	9*	6	9	3
Electives (Cognate Areas)	12-21	3	3	6
Electives Outside Education	9	---	3	6

*Full Year.

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	Auburn University	University of California Berkeley	Columbia University Teachers College	University of Florida Gainesville	Harvard University
EXIT REQUIREMENTS					
Master's Seminar	YES	W/O Thesis	YES	---	YES
Master's Written Comprehensive Examination	YES	W/O Thesis	YES	---	NO
Thesis	YES	OPT.	YES	---	NO
STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS--For Principals (Separate or Overlapping M.A.)					
Teaching Certificate	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
K-12 Teaching Experience	YES	YES	YES	YES	3 Yrs.
M.A./M.Ed. Completion	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Other Requirements	YES	---	Note[1]	Note[2]	YES
Laboratory and Internship Required	YES	YES	YES	Note[3]	YES
Number of Credits	5-15	---	---	---	Note[4]
Certification Examination	YES	N/A	YES	N/A	NO

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (S)

1. Competency-Based Certification. (Columbia Teachers College)

2. Six additional hours in Curriculum. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

3. Under consideration. (University of Florida-Gainesville)

4. State of Massachusetts requirement for school principal certification is completion of a half-practicum (150 clock hours) within one year, or an internship (300 clock hours) within two years, judged successful on the basis of specified standards and competency criteria. The Harvard School of Education requires field experience in connection with many of the required courses. (Harvard University)

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign	New York University	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Ohio State University	University of Tennessee Chattanooga
EXIT REQUIREMENTS					
Master's Seminar	E	YES	E	---	YES OR
Master's Written Comprehensive Examination	---	NO	YES	Plan B	YES
Thesis	NO	NO	NO	Plan A	YES
STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS--For Principals (Separate or Overlapping Master's Degree)					
Teaching Certificate	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
K-12 Teaching Experience	2 Yrs.	YES	YES	2 Yrs.	3 Yrs.
M.A./M.Ed. Completion	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Other Requirements	---	---	---	---	---
Laboratory and Internship Required	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Credits	4	12	3-6	3	3
Certification Examination	---	---	---	---	---

OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS

Master's in Education (M.A., M.Ed., AS-5)
Major in Administration and Supervision

	University of Texas Austin	University of Utah Salt Lake City	University of Washington Seattle	University of Wisconsin Madison
EXIT REQUIREMENTS				
Master's Seminar	YES	YES	NO	NO
Master's Written Comprehensive Examination	YES[1]	YES	YES	YES
Thesis	NO	NO	OPT.	NO
STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS—For Principals (Separate or Overlapping Master's Degree)				
Teaching Certificate	YES	YES	YES	YES
K-12 Teaching Experience	YES	---	3 Yrs.	3 Yrs.
M.A./M.Ed. Completion	YES	YES	YES	YES
Other Requirements	---	---	---	---
Laboratory and Internship Required	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Credits	---	6	6-9[2]	3
Certification Examination	---	---	---	---

Out-of-State Programs
Master's Level
Notes (U)

1. Practice Oriented. (University of Texas-Austin)

2. An individual may take as few as 18 quarter credits (and as few as 6 in laboratory/internship) in an approved program, providing that comparable competencies are demonstrated in lieu of coursework. (University of Washington-Seattle)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkinson, Judith A., and Warren, Andrea, eds. The Administrative Internship. Lawrence, KS: Women's Educational Equity Act Program, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1980.

Alkire, Gary. "Master's Programs in Educational Administration." Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States. Edited by Paula F. Silver and Dennis W. Spuck. Columbus, OH: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.

American Association of School Administrators. Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators. Arlington, VA: The Association, 1982.

________, and National School Boards Association. Selecting the Administrative Team. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1981.

Barth, Roland. "A Principal's Center." Journal of Staff Development, II (May, 1981), 52-69.

Baltzell, C. D., and Dentler, R. A. Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

Boyan, N. "Follow-the-Leader: Where Do We Go From Here?" Address presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA, 1980.

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Bridges, Edwin M. "The Nature of Leadership." Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Edited by Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977, 202-203.

________, and Baehr, Melany E. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures." Administrator's Notebook, XIX (January, 1971), 1-4.

Brookover, W. B., et al. *School Social Systems and Student Achievement--Schools Can Make a Difference*. Brooklyn, NY: Praeger Publishers, 1979.

Byrne, David R., Hines, Susan A., and McCleary, Lloyd E. *The Senior High School Principalship*. Vol. I: *The National Survey*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.

Cawelti, Gordon. "Training for Effective School Administrators." *Educational Leadership*, XXXIX (February, 1982), 324-29.

________. "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning." *Thrust*, IX (January, 1980), 8-10.

Cornett, Lynn M. *The Preparation and Selection of School Principals*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board, 1983.

Culbertson, Jack A., et al. *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies*. Columbus, OH: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1969.

Cunningham, Luvern L., and Hentges, Joseph T. *The American School Superintendency 1982: A Summary Report*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

Davis, William, and Spuck, Dennis. "A Comparative Analysis of Masters, Certification, Specialist, and Doctoral Programs." *Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States*. Edited by Paula F. Silver and Dennis W. Spuck. Columbus, OH: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.

Dunigan, Patrick. "Administration Behavior of School Superintendents: A Descriptive Study." *The Journal of Educational Administration*, I (1980), 5-26.

Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." *Educational Leadership*, XXXVII (October, 1979), 15-27.

________, and Fredericksen, John N. *Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Center for Urban Studies, 1978.

Erickson, D.A. "Research in Educational Administration: The State-of-the-Art." *Educational Researcher*, VIII (March, 1979), 9-14.

________. " New Strategy for School Improvement." Momemtum, XII (December, 1981), 46-48.

Farquhar, R. H. "Preparatory Programs in Educational Administration: 1954-1974" Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Edited by L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, and R. O. Nystrand. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

________. "Trends and Needs in Superintendent Preparation." The School Administrator, (September, 1969), 11-12

Georgia Department of Education. "Come On In . . . The Learning's Fun." Alert, XV (May, 1984), 12-22.

Goldhammer, Keith. "The Context of Education in the 1980's: The Need for Educational Statesmanship." Lecture presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Southwest Texas State University, August, 1982.

________. Elementary Principals and Their Schools. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, 1971.

Goodlad, John I. "A Study of Schooling: Some Implications for School Improvements." Phi Delta Kappan, LXIV (April, 1983), 552-58.

________. "What We Don't Know About Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan, LXI (May, 1980), 591-92

________. "An Agenda for Improving Our Schools." The Executive Review, II (May, 1982).

________. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Gorton, Richard A., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. The Senior High School Principalship. Vol. II: The Effective Principal. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary Schools Principals, 1978.

Haskins, Kenneth W. "The Care and Rehabilitation of Preservice Programs." Principal, LVII (March, 1978), 37-44; 45-51.

Hersey, Paul W. "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent." Educational Leadership, XXXIX (February, 1982), 370-71.

Howell, Bruce. "Profile of the Principalship." Educational Leadership, XXXVIII (January, 1981), 333-36.

Hoyle, John R. "Administering Learning Environments in the Twenty-First Century." Theory into Practice, XX (Autumn, 1981), 250-54.

________. "Programs in Educational Administration and the AASA Guidelines: An Opportunity." (Xeroxed), 1983.

Kelly, Noeline T. An Ethnography of a Secondary School Principal. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1975.

Lipham, James M. "Leadership and Decision Making for Effective Educational Change." The Executive Review, III (May, 1983).

________. Effective Principal, Effective School. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

LoPresti, Peter L. "Building a Better Principal." Principal, LXI (March, 1982), 32-34.

Madden, J. V., et al. "School Effectiveness Study: State of California." State of California Department of Education, 1976.

Mann, Dale. "What Peculiarities in Educational Administration Make It Difficult To Profess: An Essay." Journal of Educational Administration, XIII (May, 1975), 139-47.

March, J. G. "Analytical Skills and the University Training of Administrators." The Journal of Educational Administration, VIII (1974), 30-54.

McCleary, Lloyd E. "Field Based Preparation: Toward a Defensible Preparation Program?" The University of Utah, 1984. (Xeroxed.)

________. "Professional University." Draft of monograph, The University of Utah-Salt Lake City, 1984. (Xeroxed.)

________. "Training for the Principalship: Institution, Program, Professor," Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) document ED 077139, 1973.

________, and Thomson, Scott D. The Senior High School Principalship. Vol. III: The Summary Report. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

McIntyre, Kenneth. "Training Programs for Principals." Theory into Practice, XVIII (February, 1979), 28-32.

Miller, Lynne, and Lieberman, Ann. "School Leadership Between the Cracks." Educational Leadership, XXXIX (February, 1982), 362-67.

New York Times. Spring Education Survey, April 15, 1984.

Olivero, James L. The Principalship in California: Keeper of the Dream. The Association of California School Administrators, 1980.

Ourth, John. "Have the Universities Failed Us?" Principal, LVIII (March, 1979), 80-81.

Pellicer, Leonard O., and Buford, Connie. "Nuture Budding Principals." The Executive Educator, IV (September, 1982), 28-29.

________, et al. The Evolution and Training of School Principals. Columbia, SC: Carolina University School of Education, 1981.

Piper, Donald L. "Programs in Educational Administration: State-of-the-Art Perspective." Paper presented at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), Missoula, MT, August 8, 1983.

Pitner, Nancy J. "Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, February, 1982.

________. "Administrator Training: What Relationship to Administrator Work?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981.

________. "Hormones and Harems: Are the Activities of Superintending Different for a Woman?" Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. Edited by W. W. Charters and P. Schmuck. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc., 1981.

Professional Standards Commission. The Principalship: A Crucial Element in Quality Education. Atlanta, GA: The Commission, 1983.

________. The Principalship in Georgia: Superintendent's Perceptions. Atlanta, GA: The Commission, 1984.

Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." D. P. Gardner, chairman. Washington, D.C.: United State Government Printing Office, 1983.

Rousseau, Alan J. "The Elementary School Principal: What Training and Experience Factors Relate to His Success?" Oregon School Study Council, Eugene, OR: College of Education, University of Oregon. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) document 081072, 1971.

Rutter, Michael, et al. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Silver, Paula F. "Dimensions of Professionalism in School Administration." Record in Educational Administration and Supervision, IV (Fall, 1983), 41-45.

________. "Toward a Redefinition of Professionalism in Educational Administration." Professionalism in Educational Administration. Edited by Paula F. Silver. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1983.

________. "The Development of a Knowledge Base for the Practice of Educational Administration." Administrator's Notebook, XXIX (September, 1981), 1-4.

________. "Trends in Program Development, 1974-1978." Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States. Edited by Paula F. Silver and Dennis W. Spuck. Columbus, OH: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.

________, and Spuck, Dennis W., eds. Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States. Columbus, OH: the University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.

Sweeney, James. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership, XXXIX (February, 1982), 346-52.

Texas Professors of Educational Administration Administrator Standards Committee. Memorandum regarding TPEA position on administrator certification program standards, February 15, 1984. (Typewritten.)

University Council for Educational Administration. The Preparation and Certification of Educational Administration: A UCEA Report. Columbus, OH: The Council, 1973.

University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. The Apex Center: Center for Advancing Principalship Excellence (Special Preview Announcement) Champaign-Urbana: The Apex Center, 1984.

Wellisch, Jean B., et al. "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." Sociology of Education, LI (July, 1978), 211-26.

Willis, Q. "The Work Activity of School Principals: An Observational Study." The Journal of Educational Administration, I (1980), 27-54.

Wolcott, Harry F. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Wynn, Richard. Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

MEMBERS, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
1985

SHERMAN R. DAY, Chairman
Interim Director of Athletics,
Georgia State University
Atlanta

ALPHONSE BUCCINO
Dean, College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens

MARY W. CALLINS
Student Personnel Specialist
Coosa Valley Vocational High School
Rome

GUY H. DAVIS
Member, Carroll County Board of Education
Villa Rica

FAYE FOX
First Grade Teacher
Westwood Primary School
Dalton

LOUIS E. HARPER
Superintendent
Ben Hill County Schools
Fitzgerald

BETTY HICKMAN
Kindergarten Teacher
The Westminster Schools
Atlanta

ALICE KLEMMETSEN
Fifth Grade Teacher
Mableton Elementary School
Austell

EDWARD B. MARTIN
Principal
West Laurens Senior High School
Dublin

JAMES O. MILLER
Director, Division of Educational Studies
Emory University
Atlanta

JOHNNIE MILLER
English Teacher
Peachtree High School
Atlanta

CHARLES R. NASH
Dean, School of Education
Armstrong State College
Savannah

AUDREY OLSEN
Member, Glynn County Board of Education
Brunswick

W. J. ROCHELLE
Principal
Dalton High School
Dalton

WERNER ROGERS
Associate State Superintendent of Schools
Planning and Development
Atlanta

CAROLYN W. SAMPSON
Principal
H.A. Hunt Elementary School
Fort Valley

BETTY SLOOP
Teacher, Gifted Program
Shiloh Middle School
Lithonia

DANDY P. TAYLOR
Third Grade Teacher
White Bluff Elementary School
Savannah

JOSIE WILLS
Business Education Teacher
Academy of Richmond County
Augusta

Copies of this publication are available from the Commission. When ordering, please specify the name of the publication and send a check in the amount of $10.00 for printing and postage expenses. Please make the check payable to the Professional Standards Commission and forward to the address below.

Georgia
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
Suite 107
2945 Flowers Road South
Atlanta, Georgia 30341
(404)/656-2535